

THE  
**CHRISTIAN JOURNAL,**  
AND  
**LITERARY REGISTER.**

No. 7.]

JULY, 1828.

[Vol. XII.]

*For the Christian Journal.*

*Introduction to the Gospel of St. John.*

(Translated from Kuinoel.)

[Continued from page 164.]

§ V.—ON THE DESIGN OF JOHN IN WRITING HIS GOSPEL.

ON this subject there have been many disputes among learned men. Not a few have contended, but on insufficient grounds, that John wrote controversially, with a design to refute the errors of his day. As to the particular error which he had in view they are divided.

A. Some are of opinion that he wrote his Gospel in opposition to the Gnostics, more especially against that branch of them called Valentinians, who held many doctrines respecting æons, their number, rank, order, and genealogy, distinguished them by various names, which John himself has used in his first chapter, namely, Word, Only-begotten, Grace, Life, Truth, and supposed them to inhabit a celestial space, which they called Pleroma. But these subtleties of opinion were of later date than the apostolic times; and of the Valentinians, at least, it is evident that they endeavoured to confirm their doctrines by the authority of John. See note r. § 2. But though it should be granted that the traces of Gnosticism are discoverable in the age of John, (its doctrines were not publicly promulgated until the second century,) yet even then it would not appear, from John's use of the above mentioned terms, that he had reference to that heresy. For Jesus had called himself the Light and the Life, John viii. 12. xi. 25, and the Only-begotten, iii. 16. Whence the use of the name, the Word, was derived, we shall show hereafter, § 7. Compare Tittman, "Traces of the Gnostics sought in vain in N. T." Loeffler's Dissertation denying that the

First Epistle of John was written especially against the Gnostics, in the Theological Tracts edited by Velthusen, Rupert, and myself, vol. I. p. 153. Schmidt's Introduction, vol. I. p. 148. Wegscheider's Introd. to John, p. 218. Uster, (as quoted note c. § 4) p. 3.

B. Others contend that John wrote against Cerinthus,<sup>d</sup> a Judaizing Christian, contemporary with John,<sup>e</sup> who, from Palestine, had emigrated first into Egypt, and thence into Asia.<sup>f</sup> This opinion depends entirely on the testimony of Irenæus, who says, in the third book and twelfth chapter of his Treatise against heretics—"John, the disciple of the Lord, promulgating this faith, and wishing, by the publication of his Gospel, to extirpate that error which had been sown in the minds of men by Cerinthus, and before by those who are called Nicolaitans, (who are a shred of that 'science falsely so called,') and desirous to confute them, and convince them that there is but one God,

<sup>d</sup> So Oeder, in a Treatise on "the Gospel of John opposed to Cerinthus," Frankfort, 1732. Michaelis in his Introduction, vol. II. § 158. (See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. IV. pp. 278—284.) See also Storr, Hengius, Semler, and others.

<sup>e</sup> Lampe has endeavoured to show, but with little success, that Cerinthus lived in the second century. He has been confuted by Storr in Eichhorn's Repertorium, vol. XIV. p. 156.

<sup>f</sup> Storr contends that Cerinthus was a Gnostic. Merkel and Schmidt, that he was a Judaizing Christian, who mixed Judaism with Christianity. Paulus has endeavoured to show, in his History of Cerinthus, p. 110, ss. that he favoured Judaism, and mixed with it the doctrines of the Gnostics. (For his adoption of both which errors, see Epiphanius, hæc. 28. ed. Petav.) He has also contended, that Epiphanius (hæc. 28. L. C. hæc. 51. § 10.) and Irenæus (III. 11. 1. III. 16. 1. 1. 26.) are not inconsistent with themselves in what they have related of Cerinthus, that the times are to be distinguished, and that Cerinthus is to be considered as having passed from Judaizing Christianity, to Gnosticism still somewhat mixed with Judaism, after he had emigrated into Egypt, and thence into Asia.

who made all things by his Word, and not, as they say, that the Creator of the world is one, and the Father of the Lord another; that the Son of the Creator is one, and the Christ (who descended from the upper regions upon Jesus the Son of the Creator, but continued impassible, and flew back again to his own Pleroma) another; that the Only-begotten is indeed eternal, but that the Word is the true Son of the Only-begotten; that our world was not made by the first God, but by a certain virtue very far inferior, and cut off from communication with those things which are invisible and unutterable—the disciple of the Lord, I say, wishing to shut out all such things, and to establish in the church a rule of faith, viz. that there is but one God Almighty, who made all things by his Word, both visible and invisible, and signifying also, that through this Word, by whom God made the world, salvation was afforded to men in the world, thus commenced his Gospel—*In the beginning was the Word, &c.*” It is usual, besides this passage, to quote another from Irenæus, l. 26. 1. ed. Massuet. to prove that John wrote against Cerinthus. The passage is as follows:—“Cerinthus, a certain man in Asia, taught, that the world was not made by the first God, but by a certain virtue widely separate and distant from that principality which is above all things, and ignorant of that God who is above all. To this he subjoined, that Jesus was not born of a virgin, for this appeared to him impossible, but was the son of Joseph and Mary, after the manner of all other men, and exceeded all men in justice, prudence, and wisdom; that after his baptism the Christ descended upon him from that principality, which is above all things, in the form of a dove, and then revealed to him the unknown Father, and perfected his virtues; that at last the Christ flew back again away from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered, and rose from the dead; that the Christ, however, being a Spirit, continued impassible.” But from those passages it cannot be proved that John wrote to refute the errors of Cerinthus. For, in the first place, it cannot be ascertained whether Irenæus has

left us his opinion as a tradition, or as the mere conjecture of a commentator. That he followed tradition, appears less probable from the fact, that in another place he asserts that John wrote against the Valentinians, (see Storr in Eichhorn’s Repertorium,) whose heresy was of a later date than the times of the apostles, and against the Nicolaitans, which Eichhorn has shown to be a fictitious name, in his Commentary on the Revelation, vol. I. p. 75. Since, therefore, Irenæus has acted the part of a conjectural commentator, rather than a historian, with respect to the Valentinians and Nicolaitans, with what appearance of certainty can it be affirmed that his account of the opposition of John to Cerinthus is not also conjecture? Secondly, Irenæus in the passages quoted, and Epiphanius, hæc. 28. hæc. 51, are inconsistent with themselves in what they have related of the doctrines of Cerinthus, as Massuetus has shown, p. 164 of his Dissertation on Cerinthus, inserted in his edition of Irenæus. Learned men allow that many errors, whose authors were unknown, were attributed by the fathers to Cerinthus. In fact, therefore, we are ignorant of his real opinions. Thirdly. Even though it should be granted that Cerinthus held the erroneous opinions attributed to him, it cannot be proved that those opinions were so widely dispersed in the time of John that he could or ought to have controverted them. Fourthly. At any rate, that John had no reference to Cerinthus is evident from this, that in his Gospel there occur neither words nor phrases distinctly and accurately opposed to his errors. Had John intended to oppose Cerinthus, he would have written, “and the Word was God over all.” Cerinthus himself would have called his Christ simply God, (which word with him had a generic sense,) nor would he have hesitated to use the expression of John, “the same was with God.” Since,

§ Kuinoel also asserts, after Paulus, that in that age *θεός* had a generic sense, and the supreme God was expressed by *ὁ θεός*. His argument seems to be, that had John been aware of the errors of Cerinthus, and had he intended to controvert them, he would have used

therefore, the prologue of John, which confessedly contains the sum of the doctrine to be proved, is not distinctly and explicitly opposed to Cerinthus, and since no other passages can be found directly contradictory to his doctrine respecting the Christ; since also there are passages which Cerinthus might easily accommodate to his opinions, a fact which led some, called Alogi by Epiphanius, *hær.* 51, to suppose that the Gospel was actually written by Cerinthus, (see Paulus, *Introd.* to N. T. p. 112, and Schmidt's, vol. I. p. 148,) it is sufficiently apparent that John did not write against Cerinthus.<sup>b</sup>

C. Not a few modern interpreters are of opinion that John wrote against the followers of John the Baptist, who denied that Jesus was the true Messiah. Semler, Michaelis, Storr, Schulz, and others, adopt this hypothesis. It is rejected, however, by Paulus, Schmidt, and Eichhorn. It cannot be denied that in the age of the apostles there existed a sect, never very numerous, who were disciples of John, (*Acts* xviii. 26. xix. 1.) from which have arisen the sects of the Sabæans and Nendæans, (both derived from Syriac words, meaning "Baptists," and "Dis-

ciples of John,") which even now flourish in the East, and venerate John the Baptist as their Father, the Apostle of Light, and their Saviour. (For information on this subject see Norberg's *Dissertation on the Religion and Language of the Sabæans in Commatt.* Soc. Gotting for the year 1730, vol. III., Hugius' *Introd.* N. T. vol. II. p. 182, and Wegschneider's, p. 225.) Some maintain that the ancient followers of John received him as their Messiah, and to prove it, quote the following passage from the book of *Recognitions*, falsely attributed to Clement of Rome, Book I. c. 54, Cotel. "The Scribes also, and the Pharisees, are drawn away into another schism; these being baptized by John, and holding as a key to the kingdom of heaven the word of truth received by tradition from Moses, concealed it from the ears of the people. But of the *disciples of John*, the principal ones separated themselves from the people, and preached *their Master as the Christ.*" And in c. 60, p. 507—"One of the disciples of John affirmed, that *John was the Christ*, not Jesus—that he was to be esteemed greater than Moses and Jesus himself." There are, however, many objections to this opinion. For John, indeed, by his baptism, initiated the Jews into the new economy about to be established by the Messiah, (*Matt.* iii. 2—11,) but freely and openly professed, and on every occasion inculcated the fact upon his followers, that he was not the Christ, that Jesus was far greater than he, that Jesus was the Christ, (*John* i. 15. 30. 36. iii. 25. 26.) He sent disciples to Jesus, to incite him to begin the reign of Messiah, (*Matt.* xi. 3. *Luke* vii. 18.) Moreover, many of the disciples of John finally followed Jesus, (*John* i. 37. *Matt.* xiv. 15.) Hence it is extremely improbable that any of the disciples of John held their master to be the Christ. Nor do the passages quoted from *Acts* xviii. 24. sqq. xix. 1, favour this opinion. The historian there speaks of a certain Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, who had come to Ephesus, and of certain Ephesians, followers of John, to whom no other baptism than John's was known; he says nothing of

the article. Under this head he also uses some other illustrations which could not be passed over without contradiction, and which I have chosen to omit, especially since they are not necessary to the argument. The passage omitted might be sufficient to fill a quarter of a page of the Journal.—*Tr.*

<sup>b</sup> Nor does John in his prologue dispute against Philo. This was the opinion of Le Clerc, set forth in a book entitled "The First Eighteen Verses of Chapter I. of John, illustrated by a Paraphrase and Notes," inserted in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Le Clerc thought that John was fearful lest the doctrines of Philo should be confounded with those of Christ, and so retained the term, "the Word," because it was one generally understood, and used it in a Christian sense. But it is not probable that John had ever read Philo. See below, § 7. Besides, he passes over the other terms which Philo used, such as "oldest of beings, archangel, high priest, the image of God, eternal brightness, or reflection," &c. And as Philo accurately distinguished *ὁ θεός*, the supreme God, from *θεός*, an inferior God, St. John would have used *ὁ θεός*, if he had had Philo in view, and had wished to attribute greater dignity to "the Word" than Philo did. Lampe in his *Prolegg.* p. 205, Witsius in *Misc. Sacr.* vol. II. p. 87, and Wegscheider in his *Introduction*, have refuted this opinion of Le Clerc.

their holding their master to be the Christ. Those, therefore, who, in the period immediately succeeding the ascension of our Lord, professed themselves followers of John, were probably baptized and instructed by disciples who had attended John before the baptism of Jesus, and previous to their master's declaration that Jesus was the Christ. They were of course ignorant that Jesus was to be received as the Messiah; but they still expected the appearance of that Personage, and in the mean time esteemed John only as the greatest of the prophets, and regarded him with a singular respect. Those who contend that the Evangelist wrote against the followers of the Baptist, allege what is said of the Baptist in the Gospel. John begins his Gospel (they say) with a description of the exalted dignity of Jesus, opposes him whom he calls "the Light," to John the Baptist the herald of the Light, i. 8. 9, relates that John, in the presence of his followers, not once only, but often, confessed that Jesus was very far superior to him, i. 15. 30. 35. iii. 26, and declared to the Sanhedrim, that he himself was not Messiah, but that Messiah stood among them, i. 19—27. x. 40—42. The Evangelist (they assert) makes this frequent use of the testimony of the Baptist to show that Jesus was greater than John; and hence it is plain, that he wrote his Gospel to refute a sect who denied Jesus to be the Messiah, and preferred the Baptist to that dignity, whom he could not better convince that Jesus was superior to John, that he was the Christ, than by the repeated acknowledgments of the Baptist himself. But to this it may be replied, that it is only in the first chapter that the testimony of the Baptist is produced; throughout the remainder of the Gospel no comparison is instituted between John and Jesus. So that this hypothesis would apply only to the first chapter. Moreover, other sufficient reasons can be given for producing so fully the testimony of the Baptist. The Baptist was the first to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, possessed great weight with the Jews, and had been besides the original teacher of the Evangelist. From what

has been said, it is clear that the opinion, that the Gospel was written against the followers of the Baptist who denied Jesus to be Messiah, is not sufficiently sustained by evidence.

D. Semler (in his *Paraphr. John* i. 14.) and Bertholdt (*Conjectures on the Origin of the Gospel of John*, p. 45, and in "*Christology of the Jews in the Time of Jesus and the Apostles*," p. 153, sqq.) maintain, that John had a view to the errors of those who were afterwards called Docetæ. These, holding that the body being material was an unworthy residence for a celestial nature, denied the reality of Christ's body, and supposed him only to have appeared to die. Into which opinion, (professed, we know, in the second and third centuries, by Saturninus, Valentinus, Marcion, and the Manichees,) those Christians might easily fall, who followed the doctrines of the oriental philosophy respecting emanations, and, in accordance with that system, thought matter the origin of evil, or who were of opinion with Plato, that the mind should be as much as possible abstracted from the body, and purged of its desires, considering the body as an evil, and the greatest obstacle to the attainment of wisdom and virtue, (see Plato's *Phædo*, vol. I. p. 148. 188. *Timæus*, vol. IX. p. 328. 422. ed. Bipont. *Clement of Alexandria*, *Stromata*, Book III. p. 518. ed. Pott.); or who maintained, with Philo, the body to be the prison of the mind, (see his *Allegories*, Book III. vol. I. of his Works ed. Pfeiff. on Drunkenness, vol. III. p. 217, on Migration of Abraham, vol. III. p. 415.) and its sepulchre, (vol. II. p. 452.) and so connected with evil as to oppress the mind with its pleasures and desires, (vol. IV. p. 120. III. p. 416.) The hypothesis, that John had a view to the errors of the Docetæ in writing his Gospel, is defended by the following arguments. *First*. In the epistles of Ignatius to those churches in the bosom of which our Evangelist had lived and taught, especially in that to the Smyrnæans, chap. ii. (compare Rev. ii. 18.) the Docetæ are plainly controverted. Learned men do indeed disagree as to the authenticity of those epistles, (see May number, p. 134,



note v.) but, as Schmidt observes, even granting them supposititious, and falsely to bear the name of Ignatius, their real author would not have undertaken to refute the errors of the Docetæ in an epistle to the Smyrnæans, had that heresy never existed at Smyrna. It is plain, therefore, that there existed very early in the churches of Asia a body of men who denied the reality of Christ's body. *Secondly.* It is manifest from their sacred writings, that the Sabæans (followers of John the Baptist) also held the error of the Docetæ. This opinion is entitled to no weight. For Storr has shown, in his *Treatise on the Evangelical History and Epistles of St. John*, p. 33. p. 37, that the fact cannot be proved from their sacred books. And even if it could, it would not follow that the disciples of John, in the apostles' age, attributed a fictitious body to the Messiah, whom they as yet expected, since, as we have shown above, the Sabæans have probably departed very far from the doctrines of the original followers of John. *Thirdly.* John has also attacked the errors of the Docetæ in his First and Second Epistles, Ep. I. i. 4. iv. 2—5. (which passage Tertullian has used against the Docetæ in his *Treatise on "the Flesh of Christ,"* c. 24.) v. 6. 8. Ep. II. verse 7, see Keilins in his *Notes to the Biblioth. Gr. of Fabricius*, vol. IV. p. 782. n. 18. ed. Harles. Schmidt's *Introduction*, vol. I. p. 319. Paulus in his *History of Cerinthus*, P. II. § 23. and especially Eichhorn's *Introduction*, vol. II. p. 288. 297., where he has proved that no reference is made to the Docetæ in those epistles. *Fourthly.* That John had a view to those who attributed only an imaginary body to our Lord, may be inferred from i. 14, where he says, "the Word was made flesh," and from his choice of events in relating the death and resurrection of his Master. He relates, for instance, that a soldier drove a spear into the side of Jesus while extended on the cross, and that out of the wound flowed water and blood; and carefully remarks, that he saw it with his own eyes, xix. 34. 35.; that Mary touched the body of Jesus after his resurrection, xx. 17.; that Jesus permitted Thomas

to put his fingers into his wounds, and thrust his hand into his side, xxi. 10. ss.; that Jesus after his resurrection ate with his disciples, xxi. 5. How it is collected from these passages that John wrote against the Docetæ is not easily perceived. From the strongest passage, xix. 34. 35. it would indeed appear as if some doubted or denied the death of Jesus, (see my note upon the passage,) but it is not necessary to suppose those men Docetæ.

E. Many are of opinion that John, in writing his Gospel, used those of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and undertook to supply their omissions. Eusebius, H. E. III. 24. Jerome, in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*, c. 9. and Epiphanius, hæc. Book II. 51. § 6. all unite in attributing this design to John. Michaelis, Storr, and Schulz, have laboured to confirm this opinion. It has been refuted from the subject matter of the Gospel itself by Lampe, Semler, Schmidt, and Wegscheider. For, in the first place, discrepancies of various kinds occur in the narratives of John, and the other Evangelists, as to the order of time, for instance, and the circumstances attending the event. These differences are not of such a nature as to injure the credit of the Evangelists; indeed they are easily accounted for; still, who will affirm, that if the other Gospels had been before him, John would not have laboured after a closer conformity? Compare, on this point, John iv. 1. 3. xii. 1. comp. Matt. xxvi. 6. xviii. 39. comp. Matt. xxvii. 23. xix. 17. comp. Matt. xxvii. 32. *Secondly.* John has related many things in his Gospel which had been before related by the other Evangelists. See i. 19. compare Matt. iii. 13. Mark i. 9. Luke iii. 21. John vi. 5. comp. Matt. xiv. 13. Mark vi. 32. Luke ix. 11. John vi. 16. comp. Matt. xiv. 22. Mark vi. 15. These repetitions would have been superfluous had John merely intended to supply omissions. *Thirdly.* John has no where said that he wrote his Gospel for this purpose, and even in that remarkable place, xx. 30. he has not even made

i The opinion of Clement of Alexandria on this point may be seen on p. 130 of the May number.

mention of the other Evangelists, nor referred us to any other source of information than his own Gospel. It is probable, however, that John, one of the chief of the apostles, had read that Syro-Chaldaic Gospel which was probably composed (see Eichhorn's *Introd.* vol. II. p. 131. sq.) while he was yet in Palestine, and which had been used by the other Evangelists—(see my *Introd.* to Matthew)—still he does not seem to have had it actually before him—for he has sometimes related events less accurately than the original, see John xix. 17. comp. Matt. xxvii. 32.

F. The real design of John in writing his Gospel is sufficiently apparent from his own declaration, xx. 31—"These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life in his name." He wrote his Gospel, therefore, to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, closely united with the Father, and the proper object of faith. The same, doubtless, was the object of the other Evangelists. They, however, wrote for the common people, and in a plain and popular method. But John, who wrote later, and for a more scientific and polished people, pursued the same design in a different manner. He endeavoured to explain more accurately to the Hellenistic Jews, and to the Gentiles, the union of Christ with God. With this view, he has selected for his readers those discourses of our Lord which regarded his office of Messiah, his divine origin, and his union with the Father. He has related but few of the miracles of Jesus, and has referred to these only, to show what our Lord declared concerning himself on this or that occasion, (see § 7.) In the execution of his plan he has, in the first place, asserted his own opinion of the dignity of Christ, and his intimate union with God, i. 14; next, he has brought forward the testimony of John the Baptist, confirmed by Christ himself, i. 15. iii. 31. v. 33; he has then related what Christ himself taught upon these points, introducing also others acknowledging his divine origin, iii. 11. ss. v. 17. ss. vi. 14. 27. ss. 69. vii. 15. ss. viii. 12. ss. ix. 17. x.

12. xi. 27. xii. 35. ss. xvi. 30; he has also preserved those last discourses which Christ delivered when about to "go unto the Father," chap. xiv.—xvi., in which is clearly perceivable our Lord's anxiety, that a belief in the divinity of his person, and his mission from above, should be firmly established in the minds of the future heralds of his Gospel; he has added, chap. xvii. that solemn prayer of Christ, in which he commended his cause, and the welfare of his disciples, into the hands of God, professed his own union with the Deity, and declared his confident expectation of again enjoying the glory which he had with the Father before the world was; and, finally, he has so described the closing events of our Lord's ministry on earth, as best to illustrate his exalted dignity.

(To be continued.)

### On Pulpit Delivery.

To the Editors of the Christian Journal.

GENTLEMEN,

I take the liberty of communicating a few remarks which I have always found uppermost in my mind while engaged in the consideration of Pulpit Eloquence, and more especially of Pulpit Delivery. I have no pretensions to being myself an adept in the art—I do not mean therefore to assume the chair of instruction, but only to offer a few suggestions to the consideration of your readers.

One of the great obstacles which impede the cultivation of a proper delivery, is the variety of opinions prevalent upon the subject. One party obstinately maintains, that it is a matter of trifling importance. It is in vain that you repeat the well known saying of the old Athenian, who has been commonly supposed to have known something on the subject, that delivery is the beginning, the middle, and the end of eloquence; it is in vain that you appeal to the precepts of Cicero and Quintilian, or to the practice of all the most eloquent men since the beginning of the world; it is in vain that you insist on the native elocution of the savage, and the warm, and animated, and varied

delivery of private conversation; it is in vain that you argue from that principle of the human constitution, irreversible as the laws of the Medes and Persians, that "he who mingles the agreeable with the useful, will inevitably carry off every vote." Your adversaries most magnanimously despise authority, call Demosthenes a "foolish Greek," set down Cicero for a theorist, and brand Quintilian as a quack—launch out into a vehement tirade against affectation, extravagance, and, what they are pleased to denominate, theatrical, and conclude with the grave and oracular assurance, that matter is of greater importance than manner. They are best pleased with the man who reads or says (it cannot be called speaking) his discourse in one unvaried tone, without lifting eye or finger, and delight themselves with the idea, that their beloved *matter* is thus presented in unadorned simplicity—"beauty, when unadorned, adorned the most!" I am bound, however, to acknowledge, that there are as many who err in another extreme—who banish matter entirely from their consideration, who cry out for delivery alone, by which they mean a given quantity of noise, a variety of sounds, from the deep diapason of the organ to the shrill squeaking of the life, and certain regular evolutions of the arms backwards, forwards, upwards, and downwards, first one and then the other, and sometimes both together, which evolutions they entitle gesture. I am constrained likewise to confess, though it may make against me as the advocate of a just and graceful delivery, that the former of the parties have the advantage in their choice, since there is nothing so disgusting in the eyes of men of sense and education as mere rant and impudent pretension. Under the former speaker they may fall asleep, but they are grievously tempted to laugh at, or run away from, the latter. Between these two extremes there are intervening parties, none of which however can furnish safe directions to the inquirer after truth and nature. One cannot endure a strong expression of voice and manner. It is positive and unbecoming. A second cannot abide any

thing impassioned. It is undignified and improper. A third is actually startled at an emphatic pause. It is affected and theatrical. A fourth cannot away with any vehemence of gesture. It is pounding the cushion. They condemn, one this and another that, in terms as indefinite as their ideas, *ad infinitum*, until among them all, the unlucky individual who has ventured forth upon a voyage of discovery can find, like Noah's dove, no point on which to rest, but is obliged, baffled, and wearied, and disappointed, to return to his only ark, himself. The inference from all this is, that the public speaker must examine for himself. He must not be led away by the popular idols of the day, whose foundation is frequently as unsubstantial as the feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and whose reign, commencing in similar ignorance and misconception, proves in the end as transient as that of good King Log. He must not listen with too curious an ear after the opinions of the public. He is liable to be betrayed into faults both by his vanity and by his fears. He had better shave his head, and set himself determinately down in the cave of the Athenian, or take lessons with him only from the deep-toned ocean. Truth exists somewhere, and though she may be hid in the bottom of a well, she is worth even a laborious and perilous descent, and will certainly reward the adventurous and persevering individual who drags her up to day. He need not fear the decision of the public. Multitudes have admired the Apollo of the Vatican, who had entertained no previous ideas of a grace, a beauty, and a majesty so truly godlike, but who have proved themselves endowed with a sufficiency of taste and feeling to estimate its excellencies after they had been developed by the chisel of the artist. On the same principle, though unable to direct, the public is able to appreciate the real orator, and, what is of far greater importance, to feel and to acknowledge his persuasive and convincing influence. The professors of an art *should* be the best acquainted with its principles—they have studied with most diligence—they have compared with the greatest perseverance—

they have thought with the deepest scrutiny—they have imagined with the most glowing inspiration. Enlightened criticism from without has undoubtedly done much; but in every art, artists themselves have established its principles and models. Let then the student in eloquence commence with feeling the independence of his art—let him gather courage to say to the intrusive critic, “Ne sutor ultra crepidam”—let him examine with that ardour and perseverance which are the life’s breath of genius, and he cannot fail of his reward.

But, I seem to hear some objector exclaim with horror against converting elocution into an art—He would leave all to inspiration and to nature. This prejudice, ridiculous as it must appear to every mind which has reflected on the subject, is yet no inconsiderable obstacle to the cultivation of our art. There are some minds that are not able, and many more that will not take the trouble, to distinguish the various meanings of the term. With them all *art is deceit*; though in fact the aim and perfection of the sort of art of which we speak is *truth*. Substitute another word for art—call elocution a *science*, the science of expressing our ideas with propriety and force—and this often-urged and popular objection vanishes at once. Such is the dependence of the superficial on a name. A part of the objection, however, remains unanswered. Even those who are too discerning to be so very foolishly misled, may still be inclined to maintain that elocution is best taught by nature. This position is perfectly correct, while their meaning is as far from truth as possible. Elocution is best taught by nature, that is, by the study, and comparison, and selection, and practice of what nature dictates in the expression of argument, assertion, emotion, or passion. This, however, is not their meaning. By nature they mean the absence of study, the habits of the individual. Can any thing be more absurd? Let us see the consequences. A stammerer follows nature, in this meaning of the term, when he stutters through his discourse, torturing the ears and excruciating the

feelings of all who hear him. The more he stutters, the more he follows nature, the more eloquent he is. A speaker who is accustomed to deliver himself in a sort of recitative, whose cadences return at regular intervals, and fall upon the ear with undeviating uniformity, so that he have studied in no other, must also be allowed to be of this school of nature. And so with all who have never bestowed a thought on elocution, nor attended to a single precept of art. The error here lies in a double misconception. First, in supposing, that so long as a person speaks without study, without attention to the rules of art, he must needs speak naturally. It is obvious, however, that bad example, and a thousand other external causes, may and often do produce an affected and truly artificial manner of delivery. The second misconception lies in mistaking individual for universal nature—in substituting a single instance deformed by native peculiarities, and what is more, by acquired habits, for that beautiful ideal, which, though existing only in the imagination, is yet the result of extensive comparison, of careful selection, of a refined taste, and a discerning judgment. We are told that a Grecian painter, when endeavouring to delineate the perfection of beauty, selected various parts from various individuals, and compounding all into a consistent whole, succeeded in realizing the dream of his imagination. Thus, in his case, art and study were but the means which led to the attainment of nature in her best and brightest form. And so must it be with the student of eloquence. In the best models he can find of public speaking, in the rules of ancient and modern rhetoricians, but, above all, in the tones and inflections of familiar, or earnest, or impassioned conversation, he must study nature in order to arrive at the perfection of his art, or, if the phraseology be preferred, (the meaning is still the same,) he must make use of the instrumentality of art to attain the perfection of nature.

Still, however, I am haunted by the ghost of the objection which I flatter myself I have just slain. I



seem to hear one pertinaciously asserting, that the pulpit at least should be kept sacred from the inroads of art. No man can more highly reverence the holy functions of the pulpit orator than myself. I "magnify" his "office." And it is for this very reason that I would preserve it inviolate, not from an art which is synonymous with truth and nature, but from awkwardness, dullness, monotony, and affectation, the legitimate fruits of ignorance and inattention. The manner proper for the pulpit is derived from precisely the same great principle as that appropriate to the bar, the senate, or the stage. The fundamental rule is in all to follow nature. The sole difference, the only justifiable peculiarity of pulpit delivery, arises from the nature of the subject about which it is conversant. It has nothing to do with angry debate, with sarcasm, or with the expression of the merry humour or evil passions of the drama. It must be often solemn, always grave. Yet is it natural, is it becoming in the minister of God, to deliver his message from heaven to the perishing souls of men without emotion, gesture, intonation, with the coldness of a stone, and the stillness of a stock? Is it to be justified on any principle of art or nature, truth or duty, that he should speak of coming perdition, as if he thought it not more probable than that the church roof should fall in upon his audience? that he should exhort them to avoid eternal torment, with less earnestness than he would advise them to get in out of the rain? that he should describe the joys of heaven, with cooler indifference than he would tell of the pleasures of a dinner? In a sincere man, is this natural? In a man of sense, is it reasonable? In a pious man, is it not most strange? In a minister of God, an ambassador for Christ, is it not forgetfulness of his responsibility, and negligence of his duty?

After a preface so extended, I feel that I must not trespass proportionably long upon your readers for the particular remarks which are to follow. Without pretending to be very nice or philosophical in the choice of terms, I would arrange what I may find to say

VOL. XII.

under the heads of Key, Enunciation, Inflection, Emphasis, and Gesture.

*And, first, of Key.*—It is a frequent remark, that the key of voice used by public speakers is in general too high, or, in other words, that the voice is too shrill, not sufficiently deep. The effect of such a key is disagreeable. The lower notes of all musical instruments are more generally pleasant than the higher. A low voice (not in sound, but in key) is "an excellent thing in" man as well as "woman." Further, a low voice may be heard with much greater ease than a high one. The latter may indeed be audible at the greatest distance, but the former is by far the best adapted to convey articulate sounds. To be heard is of course the first object of a public speaker. A low voice must be consequently an object of desire. Nor is this all. A low key of voice is essential to expression. In a climax, for instance, of many members, if the first be pronounced in a high key, one of two things must happen. Either the gradual swell appropriate to the climax must be neglected, or the voice must be run up close to the borders of the falset, and perhaps at last break into it, like an unmanaged horse from a trot into a gallop. If an animated question occur while the voice is raised to a high pitch, its effect is marred or lost. The same will be the case with regard even to a single remarkably emphatic word. On the other hand, in avoiding Scylla we must not fall into Charybdis. A tone too low not only has the appearance of formality and mock solemnity, but defeats grave and really solemn expression in the same manner as too high a key does the animated or impassioned. Of too low a tone, however, there is but little danger, since the tones of conversation are always too high for public speaking, and thus the bias of habit is entirely on the other side. To close my remarks upon this subject, a friend of great experience assures me, that the reduction of the voice to a lower key in the ordinary current of discourse, though not easy, is yet practicable. It is to be effected only through practice. The best method is to select some sepulchral

sound, and to pronounce it repeatedly and forcibly, day after day, for months, in the lowest pitch that can be attained. On the improvement of the voice in general, I would only add the testimony and the advice of the Roman orator, "*Vocis quidem bonitas optanda est: non est enim in nobis: sed tractatio atque usus in nobis. Ergo ille princeps variabit et mutabit; omnesque sonorum, tum intendens, tum remittens, persequetur gradus.*"

*Secondly, of Enunciation.*—There are many men who have voice enough to preach in the open air, and to be heard by thousands, who yet are not heard distinctly within even very limited walls. There are others who, with manifest feebleness of lungs, are heard by the remotest listener. Audibleness, so to speak, does not depend so much upon vociferation as upon distinctness of utterance. Many persons become indistinct from general rapidity of utterance, hurrying sound upon sound with such celerity as to confuse and confound the sense of hearing—others, however deliberate they may be, become indistinct from the perpetual and unnatural variation of their tones, and the uniform failure of the voice wherever a cadence is intended. Others, again, pass over many of the sounds necessary to complete a word. The unfortunate syllables, tion, sion, ence, ness, al, and a multitude of others, are condemned almost uniformly to inarticulation. Vowels in the middle of a polysyllable, and consonants at the end of every word, are left unuttered. The inevitable effect must be to render the speaker unintelligible. The best remedy that can be devised for this is the long and frequent practice of all the elementary sounds of the language by themselves, and in combination, and the patient repetition of the words and syllables, which have been habitually neglected. I would impress upon my readers the necessity of the practice of the elementary sounds particularly. They know not how often they are in the habit of slurring them over, uttering them indistinctly, and even changing one sound for another.

*Thirdly, of Inflection.*—On this sub-

ject I am afraid of being absolutely unintelligible, unless to those who have paid some attention to the art of elocution. The two principal inflexions are the upward and downward, the former of which is generally found at the close of interrogative forms of speech, and the latter in the ordinary close of a sentence. Between these two there is a level termination which is exceedingly expressive, especially in many passages of the Liturgy; for instance, at the close of many sentences of the *Te Deum*. There are, besides, waves of the voice of various kinds, adapted to all the varied expressions required by language. All these inflexions of the voice are varied again by the interval occupied in the utterance of them, whether it be a third, a fifth, or an octave, a circumstance which materially affects their force and meaning. I would assure the uninitiated, that this is not the mere jargon of theory, that these inflections constitute one of the most important qualities of speech, that they actually exist in nature; and, above all, that from their delicacy they are peculiarly subject, unless proper care is taken in their cultivation, to neglect and abuse. Without a proper disposition of them not only is tenderness unfelt, and passion worse than wasted; but the plain meaning of a plain sentence is often obscured or lost. Upon this subject, and almost every other connected with speech, I would refer the reader to the late admirable Treatise of Rush on the Philosophy of the Human Voice, a work which, with many glaring defects of style, is, in my humble judgment, correct, original, and profound, earnestly entreating him, if he be a public speaker, or be intended for one, to master its contents, and then decide for himself. I must venture once more to quote the authority of Cicero, in order that the reader may be aware of the existence of far higher testimony than my own, to the importance of the inflections of the voice—"Vocis mutationes totidem sunt quo animorum qui maxime voce commoventur." He alludes also to disputes between Demosthenes and Æschines—"Quom aliter alteri objecit vocis flexiones," and

endeavours to impress upon him, "qui eloquentiæ principatum petit," the necessity of variety of inflections, and diligence in their cultivation.

*Fourthly, of Emphasis.*—Most speakers would be grievously affronted, should you be bold enough to tell them to their face, that they emphasize very badly in the delivery of their own compositions. They take it as an insult to their understanding to be told that they cannot express their own meaning, as equivalent indeed to saying, that they have no meaning at all. Yet, under shelter of an anonymous communication, I must take the liberty to tell them a little wholesome truth. The fact is, as above stated. Most men do emphasize very badly in the delivery of even their own compositions—and mainly for this reason, that they really do not understand them. Permit me to explain. Let any man take a complicated sentence, and after having mastered it thoroughly himself, let him attempt to read it off hand to another person. Ten chances to one he will not read it in such a way as to make it at all intelligible—and fifty to one he will not read it so as to give it its full expression. The eye is quicker than the ear, and requires less assistance. It catches the idea without ever dreaming of the emphatic word. Thus, in general, though speakers understand their own meaning, they do not understand the mode of its communication. Various minor causes contribute to increase the defect. Many speakers have a given melody which returns as regularly upon the ear as the verses of a metrical psalm. A certain part of this melody requires stress, which is frequently given without regard to sense. The melody must be preserved, though the meaning be lost. In other cases, though the melody be not quite so regular, a sonorous word proves an irresistible temptation, and leads the musical speaker to dwell upon it long and fondly. With others, certain strong or comprehensive terms, such as, all, none, more, &c. are of course emphatic. Others, again, from negligence, and inattention, convert intervening clauses into the main idea, lay stress upon a word whose meaning has been

before implied, or, still more distressingly, insist on marking, with the fullest expression in their power to give, a repetition made, not for the sake of emphasis, but of explanation. It is hardly worth while to add to these causes certain instances in which a discourse is read in public without having undergone a second perusal in private, or in which one is delivered to an audience immediately after having been delivered from the bottom of a drawer. Such a state of preparation must be obviously destructive of all emphasis. A discourse is begun, the scope of which is not understood. A sentence is begun, of which the end is scarcely conjectured. The speaker blunders on from one no-meaning to another, and succeeds at last in nothing but in puzzling his audience. From the causes of the deficiency the remedy is to be inferred. Patient study, and investigation with a knowledge of the difficulty before us, are our only resources. The inversion of a sentence is of use—attention to familiar conversation is here absolutely necessary. With regard to the two kinds of emphasis, distinguished by stress and quantity, and with regard to the various degrees of stress, I would refer to more formal writers on this subject. One word as to the emphatic pause. We are told, that in some cases silence is more impressive than speech. If ever it be so, it is after the enunciation of some sublime idea, which, not fully expressible by words, appears to call on feeling, or on meditation, to make up the deficiency—it is when expectation is aroused to some coming declaration, and when the suspense of a moment is allowed to stimulate anxiety and interest. The total avoidance of this natural and powerful instrument of eloquence, by some speakers, reminds me of my school-boy days. A luckless urchin had chosen for his speech, the defence of Brutus before the people after the murder of Cæsar. He began with trepidation—this was well for a school-boy, though not quite so appropriate to the dignified and fearless stoic. After a sentence or two, however, he proceeded with tolerable fluency. The stream increased in rapidity as it descended. At length he

came to the passage—"I pause for a reply." Instead of a pause, there was an actual bound in his discourse, swift as it had been before—as if the "honourable" Brutus had been afraid of being taken at his word, and actually told "whom he had offended," he went on with his defence with all the speed his breath allowed him, and his jaded organs could attain.

*Fifthly, of Gesture.*—Under gesture are included by Cicero the expression of the countenance, and the attitude of the person, as well as the motions of the arms. With regard to the first, I should say that it was dangerous to meddle with beyond a certain point. It had better be let alone, with one single exception. This exception is an attempt to remove disagreeable peculiarities, such as winking the eyes, occasionally twisting the muscles of the mouth in various directions, and, above all, that deforming frown so apt in many speakers to accompany the slightest effort. With regard to the body, the posture should in general be erect and free, there should be "nulla mollitia cervicum." But if ever the body be bent forward for the sake of entreaty, or in the earnestness of argument, great care should be taken that the lungs are not embarrassed by a stoop in the shoulders, or a curve in the back-bone. The bend should be made from the hip. One more caution. Let every public speaker learn to stand still. Nothing can be more awkward or disagreeable than fidgetting and swaying the body from one side to another. As to the arms, I would say, that when no gesticulation is intended, they should be preserved in a state of rest. This caution is not so entirely unnecessary as might at first appear. I have seen an excellent writer, who, to me at least, destroyed much of the effect of what he was saying by regularly lifting up his right hand, and laying it on his discourse at the beginning of his first sentence. At the commencement of the second, down went the right, and up came the left. At the next another change was made, and so the see-saw was continued. Nothing is more awkward in society, or in the pulpit, than

the appearance of not knowing what to do with one's hands. Another caution I would give, is to avoid beating time with the arm to the variations in melody which take place in the sentence—let there not be "ad numerum articulatus cadens." To this, however, there is a single exception, that of beating time to an emphatic word, or, in other words, causing the arm to descend with force while it is pronounced; which is sometimes both natural and energetic. On the subject of gesture, I would warn the student against the rules of rhetoricians. There is one, for instance, that the arm should never be lifted above the head. This is certainly an unnatural restriction. I have even now before me in my mind's eye a picture by Guido of John the Baptist in the act of uttering the words, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord." The arm is extended upward in a position the most graceful and majestic imaginable, and yet it is far above the prescribed level. I would sooner receive the authority of Guido in such a matter than that of any rhetorician whatsoever. But although not inclined to listen overmuch to the rules of art on this point, I would not leave all to the instigation of the moment. A forced gesture need not appear unnatural, and has sometimes a great tendency to excite the dormant energy and animation of the speaker. I would advise the student to practise gesticulation at home, to improve the use of his arms by exercise, to have some general idea of the motions adapted to the discourse which he is about to deliver, and after that, keeping in view the single remark just made in the preceding sentence, I would bid him trust to the inspiration of actual delivery.

*In conclusion,* Messrs. Editors, I would remark upon the folly of those who hope to acquire the Art of Elocution without study, or by the devotion of a few hours at distant intervals to its cultivation. I have said enough even in these few brief hints to demonstrate, if they are admitted to be correct, that it is an art embracing many particulars, and difficult of attainment. If I shall thus awaken the attention,



and arouse the diligence of any, I shall feel myself amply rewarded. Meanwhile, I would entreat such, not to be discouraged. Days, months, and years may, nay, must elapse, before they can approach the goal where their reward awaits them. Eloquence, that "omnium regina rerum," (as she has been called by two of her most eminent disciples,) will not "unsought be won." She appoints her votaries as long a period of probation and labours as various and difficult as the knight-errant of old was condemned to undergo by the self-respect and coyness of his lady—love. She must be pursued indeed in the very spirit of true chivalry. Watching must be endured, sacrifices must be made, monsters must be overcome. There can be no disappointment in the issue—the promised guerdon will be certainly bestowed. Nor is it of a fantastic and transient nature. In the minister of Christ it is the happy consciousness of having laboured to fulfil his duty—it is the capacity of being useful to the souls of men—it is the possession of another attribute of a messenger from heaven, of another weapon to assault the powers of darkness, of another mean to attain the esteem and confidence of men, the approbation and favour of his God.

Yours, &c.

D. E.

---

For the Christian Journal.

#### A SERMON,

*Preached in several Churches and Chapels in the City of New-York, for the Benefit of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society, by the Rev. GEORGE UPFOLD, M. D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New-York. Published by request.*

Matthew ix. 37.—"The harvest truly is plentiful, but the labourers are few."

SUCH was the exclamation of our Redeemer, when he surveyed the moral condition of that world which he came to save, and contemplated the fearful ravages of sin. Deplorable and extensive appeared the spiritual desti-

tution of his creatures, and vast and arduous the work of bringing into successful culture the garden of the Lord, choked for ages with noxious weeds, and overrun with thorns and briars.

But his language intimated no misgivings in regard to the accomplishment of his work of mercy—no distrust of ultimate success. He declared only the magnitude of the enterprize in comparison of the ostensible means of its achievement. He was moved with *compassion*, it is written, when he saw the multitudes, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd—and he spake *thus*, not to fill his followers with despondency, but to point out the urgent demands for their labours, and to incite them to correspondent zeal and exertion. While his eye rested on the devastations of sin, and the misery of its victims, glorious visions of the future passed before him. He discerned, amid all this sterility, the materials and the promise of abundant fruitfulness. He contemplated this barren wilderness, irrigated and nourished by streams of living water, and converted into fruitful fields covered with golden sheaves. He saw the solitary place made glad by the refreshing dews of the Spirit—the desert teeming with luxuriance rejoicing and blossoming as the rose—the harvest ripe, and ready for the sickle of the reapers. He beheld the impetuous torrent of evil, which for ages had been rolling onward with wide-spread havoc, arrested by the pure and peaceful influence of the Gospel. He perceived the chains of error severed, the spell of superstition broken, and the immortal soul emancipated from its perilous delusions, enlightened, converted, and sanctified by the radiance of heavenly truth. He contemplated his religion marching onward in its resistless might, gathering strength as it progressed, and making good the promise of prophecy, which, proclaiming him "King of Sion," invested him with the sceptre of universal dominion, and gave him the "heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession!"

And, my brethren, it was not long

before this prospect was realized in the triumphs of the cross over the powers of darkness, in the recognition of our Redeemer's claims by Jews and Gentiles, and in the gathering of multitudes of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, into his visible kingdom, offering on the consecrated altars of the Christian church a freewill-offering with an holy worship. The harvest plentiful, the ingathering of its fruits was unexampled. Few were the labourers, and to human conception most incompetent to the undertaking. But their work was the *work of God*, and it prospered. The Lord of the harvest recognized them as his servants, and furthered their labours. Commanded to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, they obeyed the mandate of love, and their achievements were commensurate with the greatness of the enterprize, and the glory of its Author. Proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation through a crucified Saviour, and repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and obedience of his precepts, as the conditions of that salvation, crowds of broken hearted penitents, awakened to a sense of their misery and danger, heard with joy the gracious intelligence, and casting away their former delusions, flocked around the heralds of the cross, imploring mercy from that Holy One whom they announced as the world's Redeemer, *willing and mighty* to save.

Yes, brethren, the work in which the humble followers of Christ were engaged was evidently the *work of God*. He who sent them sped them on their way, and honoured their mission. But a few years comparatively elapsed ere what their Master saw in distant prospect began to be developed, and the first visions of glory which met his eye to be successively realized. On every side the pure and hallowed influence of the Gospel was felt and owned by perishing sinners, and the work of moral renovation progressed among the guilty and the wretched. Scarce had Jerusalem been called to welcome her spiritual King, and the cities of Judah bade, "Behold your God," before the name of Jesus was had in honour

among the Gentiles, and distant countries were made glad with the news of salvation. The incipient faith, fraught with consolation, and hope, and joy, dispelling the moral darkness which had so long rested on the earth, and bringing life and immortality to light, spread with marvellous rapidity; and in despite of prejudice, and reproach, and persecution, and death, found a ready reception in the hearts of thousands. Human wisdom was confounded at its progress—human pride was humbled by its triumphs. The world beheld with profound astonishment a religion, derived from one in the lonely condition of a Jewish peasant, and propagated by a few poor fishermen of Galilee, overthrowing the time-honoured schemes of philosophers, and rising in glory on their ruins. Systems of faith deep rooted in the affections of men, most congenial to human passions and sensual pleasures—closely interwoven with the temporal interest, reputation, and enjoyment of their votaries—sanctioned by ancient usage, and held sacred and indefeasible, yielded to its sway, and sank into oblivion. The boasted law and magnificent ritual of the Jew bowed down before it, and the altars of Gentile superstition crumbled into dust. The blood-stained banners of the cross waved triumphant in Moses's seat, and over the splendid domes of pagan worship. Each revolving year added new trophies of victory, and new accessions to the host of the faithful. Kings and princes, the wise and the mighty, gave in their adhesion to the Christian system, and adored the despised Nazarene as their Saviour and their God. The triumph of truth increased—the scene of glory expanded—until at length imperial Rome, the strong hold of idolatry, became the citadel of the faith; hymns of praise to the crucified One were heard in the palace of the Cæsars—and the cross, emblazoned on the shield of the warrior, was borne by the martial legions of the Empire, at once the sacred sign of national recognition, and the sure pledge of victory.

Thus wonderful, my brethren, was the progress of the religion of Christ, so inauspiciously begun, and commit-

ted to instruments so apparently inadequate.

Do you ask the cause of all this, and inquire, by what means these glorious results were produced? Let a distinguished actor in that great moral revolution answer. "It pleased God," says St. Paul, "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." By the preaching of Christ crucified, by the exhibition of the humbling doctrines of the grace of God by his authorized messengers, was this mighty change brought about, and the people which sat in darkness irradiated with heavenly light. In that way, indicated by Christ himself, when he bade his disciples "pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest;" and which he afterwards expressly commanded, when he invested them with ministerial authority, and committed the church, purchased with his precious blood, to their supervision and care, were these marvellous effects of his grace exhibited. We read, it is true, that the preaching of the apostles was accompanied by extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Spirit—that the Lord confirmed their words by signs following; and we are taught to ascribe not a little of the reception and honouring of their message, to the miracles which they were empowered to work in confirmation of it. But still the means—the efficient means—by which the gracious plan of God was furthered and brought to such successful issue, was the *preaching of the word*, the announcement and enforcement of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel by the living teacher, and his personal appeals to the heart and to the conscience. Foremost in the moral conflict was seen the minister of Christ wielding the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; illustrating, enforcing, and defending the principles of his religion; imparting the appointed ordinances of the Gospel in connexion

with its sacred truths; "warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom;" "in meekness instructing those that opposed themselves;" "reproving, rebuking, exhorting, with all long-suffering and doctrine;" initiating his converts, when penitent and believing, into the spiritual fold; feeding them there with the bread of life in the instituted means of grace; and guiding them, by reiterated lessons of holiness, in the path to heaven.

By efforts such as these, my brethren, was the great purpose of God in the conversion of the nations originally accomplished, and the desert places of the earth reclaimed from the withering curse of sin. And in this way, expressly appointed by God himself, and sanctioned by apostolic and primitive usage, is the contest with evil still to be carried on. Other means, it is true, there are, and they are not to be neglected. That exalted benevolence which would send the Bible into all lands, and place it in the possession of every accountable being—which would accompany that invaluable treasure with the Book of Common Prayer—which would give extensive circulation to those silent, but useful messengers of truth, Religious tracts—commends itself to the patronage of every follower of Christ, and finds an advocate in every Christian bosom. But these things, important as they are in their place, and sedulously employed as they ought to be in the sacred cause of God and his Church, are intrinsically, and of divine sanction, subordinate to the work of the ministry. The latter was the means employed by apostles and martyrs in doing their Master's will—the latter is the means to which we are indebted for our Christian privileges; and by the same means is the Gospel now to be spread with the surest promise of success—the future victories of the cross won, secured, and improved—and that consummation of grace accomplished, so eloquently described in prophetic song, and so ardently desired by every Christian heart, when the triumph of truth shall be complete, and "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, the name of Jehovah Jesus shall be great among

the Gentiles," and in every place incense shall be offered unto him, and a pure-offering—when wars shall cease in all the earth, and "peace shall flow as a river, and righteousness as the waves of the sea"—when the banners of salvation shall float on every high hill, and the bland and holy influence of the Christian faith pervade every lovely vale; and earth unite with heaven, and men with angels, in simultaneous adoration of the King of Saints, proclaiming his glory, his majesty, his might, his mercy, and his grace, in the exulting exclamation—Hallelujah! the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.

Yes, my brethren, by the personal labours of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, is the war with the powers of darkness to be most successfully waged, and perishing sinners rescued from the grasp of the destroyer. By the instrumentality of the living teacher, principally and most effectually, are the waste places of the earth to be cultivated, the faith once delivered unto the saints promulgated and defended, and the "Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," built up and enlarged. By the humble labours of missionaries, like the zealous Martyn, and the devoted Middleton, and the sainted Heber, wending their way into the *land* of the infidel and the scorner—hazarding their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ—engaging hand to hand, and face to face, with error and sin—imparting the signs and pledges of salvation in connexion with the offer of that invaluable gift—presenting the great truths of God in connexion with the church of God; is the march of true religion to be accelerated, and its sublime doctrines, its pure precepts, and its consoling hopes, commended to the acceptance of the ignorant and the guilty, and made to find in the hearts of the blinded votaries of superstition a *welcome* and a *home*.

But I need not dwell on this theme, nor enlarge on the importance of missionary labours. Their value, and their efficiency in evangelizing the world, must be evident to every reflecting mind. From their very nature, and from their peculiar exercise, they com-

mend themselves to the sober judgment of all as the principal and most effective means of speeding the course of the everlasting Gospel into places where *it hath not yet found its way*, and of cherishing, fostering, and improving its sanctifying influence *where it is already known*.

Leaving, therefore, the consideration of the means of promulgating our most holy faith, I proceed to the more particular design of this discourse, which is to apprise you of scenes of existing spiritual destitution, and to endeavour to enlist your compassion and your charity in their melioration and removal.

"The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few."

In showing the application of these words of our Saviour to the present state of the world, it may be thought that the distant land of the heathen affords the fullest demonstration of their truth, and their wants present the most urgent claims on your benevolence. Multitudes of our fellow creatures, it is lamentably true, are still groaning under the iron yoke of superstition—living literally "without hope and without God in the world"—sunk in gross and degrading vice, and bowing down in senseless and criminal adoration to imaginary deities, the works of their own hands. Over vast countries a dense cloud of moral gloom impends, fraught with evil and woe, and constituting the places which it overshadows emphatically "lands of darkness and of the shadow of death." In these places, and among these people, so ignorant, so depraved, so wretched, most fervently is it to be desired that the true light should shine, and the converting and purifying influence of the Gospel be diffused. And God forbid that any damp should be cast on that hallowed zeal which would irradiate these benighted ones with the knowledge of salvation through a crucified Redeemer; that any obstacle should be thrown in the way of those charitable efforts which are making to send forth the heralds of heavenly mercy, proclaiming to these bewildered idolaters the unsearchable riches of Christ.

But, my brethren, while our hearts are enkindled with proper zeal in be-



half of the heathen, and respond to every *judicious* and *practicable* plan for their relief—let us not close our eyes to other scenes of moral misery, nor turn a deaf ear to the cry of other classes of the spiritually destitute.

Do you ask where these are to be found? I answer, within our own borders. Yes, brethren, within the sphere of our immediate observation, is the harvest plenteous—most plenteous—but the labourers few. Among those whom we recognize as fellow citizens, the Christian philanthropist finds objects enough to excite his tenderest compassion, and induce his utmost charity. Numerous are the waste places in this otherwise favoured land, and urgent is the call for labourers to go forth and engage in their cultivation. Within our own state, within the precincts of our own ecclesiastical boundaries, there are multitudes who faint, and are scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. Among those whom we call our brethren, professors of the same faith, members of the same Christian family, wide and extensive is the field for missionary labours, and frequent and piteous are the supplications for the ministry and ordinances of the Gospel. To these it is, the enterprising inhabitants of our new settlements—of hamlets and villages emerging from the ruins of the forest, where, from the very nature of the case, there must be a great want of religious privileges, and of the ability to obtain and secure them—to these it is, that the society, in whose behalf I now solicit your bounty, directs its labours of love. Of the manner in which they expend their zeal, the reports which have been sent to your houses afford sufficient information; and the accompanying documents, exhibiting the stations and success of the missionaries whom they assist in sending forth, speak volumes in praise of their undertaking, and place in a vivid light the value and importance of their services. With such an explanation in your hands, it is not required of me to enter into a detail of their operations. I have only to say, that they are most zealously and usefully employed in building up our Apostolic church, and ex-

tending to its needy members the pure worship of their choice; that their means are very unequal to their zeal, or to their opportunities of doing good; that aiding in the support of thirty missionaries, there is at this moment openings, with a prospect of immense utility, and with urgent solicitations for the privilege, for double that number; that application after application is made to the Bishop, and the Missionary Committee, which they are obliged again and again to refuse, for the want, not of labourers, nor of persons willing and competent to labour, but of the means of sending them forth. These, brethren, are facts, and facts which demand your serious attention, and call loudly for your charitable interposition. Let me also remind you, that the utmost sum which can be allowed the missionaries who are already employed, is the miserable pittance of 125 dollars per annum. The design of the present appeal is in part to increase this most inadequate compensation. But particularly do I solicit your charity, to enable this society to extend the sphere of its usefulness—to multiply the number of its messengers of good tidings—to impart the word and ordinances of the Gospel to places not yet favoured with them—to occupy the constantly expanding field of missionary labour within this extensive diocese—and to gladden the hearts of our destitute brethren with the ministrations of the church of their *fathers*, or of their *adoption*.

Yes, brethren, in behalf of the members of the same household of faith, removed, in the course of divine Providence, from their former home and their former privileges; deprived of those religious ordinances which they prize above all price, and which the poverty necessarily attendant on their situation prevents them from obtaining; in behalf of these deserving objects I appeal to your Christian liberality. I ask you to aid in furnishing the poor emigrants, the destitute pioneers of the wilderness, with the means of grace, and the precious truths of salvation—with effective restraints from sin, and incitements to holiness—with guidance and instruction in the days of health,

and with consolation and hope in the gloomy hour of sickness and of death—those whose hardy enterprize is pouring the flood-tide of wealth into your city; who are converting the forest into a fruitful field; opening new avenues to your commerce, and creating new and increasing demands for that merchandize, by which many of you directly, and all indirectly, are growing rich. I ask you to impart a portion of your abundance to promote the spiritual prosperity of those, from whose industry and privations you derive such essential benefit, and enable them to obtain that treasure, in comparison of which temporal wealth is but the veriest poverty. I ask you to assist in extending to others the blessings which ye yourselves so freely enjoy, and which I trust ye highly value—to aid this society in sending forth the ambassadors of Christ, fraught with stores of heavenly wealth—carrying the message of mercy, and the consolations of religion, to the humble cottage—dispensing the word and sacraments among the children of poverty—making the wilderness vocal with praise to God—and combating in person with that prevalent infidelity, which is spreading its baleful influence through our land, and sweeping its desert places with the besom of destruction.

These, brethren, are the objects for which I most earnestly solicit your charity; and in contributing to them you open innumerable springs of benevolence, and sow seed which shall bring forth an hundred fold of good to the church and cause of the Redeemer. The wants which I ask you to aid in supplying are imperious—the objects which I have pointed out are deserving objects—they are calling daily for our interposition, and pleading for relief. And are their claims to be neglected? Shall this relief be denied them? This society says, No!—and every benevolent heart, every friend to pure and undefiled religion, will promptly respond to their decision. The harvest is plenteous, and its precious fruits must not be lost for the want of labourers to gather them in. The waste places of Sion must not be left uncultivated. The poor and the indi-

gent of our land, and especially of the same household of faith, must not perish for lack of knowledge—must not famish in the midst of plenty—must not mourn in hopeless destitution. In using this language, I would indulge the hope that I speak your own sentiments. You will minister to their wants—you will cheer their drooping hearts with the means of grace—you impart to them those invaluable privileges of which they are deprived, and the loss of which they so affectingly lament; and give them, in the preaching of the word, and in the ministrations of the church, “the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.”

Am I mistaken in my anticipations? Do I miscalculate your compassion—your sense of duty—your zeal and charity? Will you content yourselves with saying, to these your suffering brethren, “Depart in peace—be ye warmed, and be ye filled, and give them not those things that be needful?” Do any of you complain of the frequency of these applications? What then, my brethren? Have you forgotten the apostolic admonition, “Be not weary in well doing?” Will such benevolence injure you? In answering these appeals as your conscience may dictate, will you subject yourselves to any material privation of earthly comforts? At the end of the year, will you find yourselves any the poorer for what you give away in this species of charity? Oh, no! And, moreover, the gift, no matter how oft repeated, always produces its own reward—in the approval of conscience, in the gratifying assurance of having done your duty—of having carried joy and peace into some abode of sorrow, comforted some aching bosom, given the bread of life to some famishing soul, rescued from impending destruction, some sinner ready to perish—but, above all, of having met the approbation of Him who hath commanded us to love one another as he hath loved us, and who hath said, in regard to the relief of the poor and the needy, “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.”

Episcopalians have been charged with insensibility to the spread of the Gospel—with indifference to missionary efforts—with disgraceful apathy in all that concerned the spiritual welfare of their fellow men. I have yet to be convinced of the truth of this imputation. I cannot bring myself to think so unworthily of my brethren; and I indulge the hope, that your present liberal contribution will furnish an additional proof, that, so far as you are concerned, the charge is calumnious and false. Let not my favourable anticipations be disappointed. Have pity, brethren, have pity on the destitute—give a *practical* evidence of your sense of Christian privileges, of your zeal for religion, of your attachment to the church. Help to swell the triumphs of the cross, and cause the word of God to have free course, and be glorified. Let deeds, and not protestations alone, express your gratitude to God for his heavenly grace, and the sincerity of your daily prayer, “Thy kingdom come.”

• Brethren, I commend to your benevolence the claims of this society, and I look with confidence to your accustomed liberality for an answer commensurate with their importance. The objects which engage their zealous solicitude, and partake of their labours of love, are legitimate objects of charity;

the cause which they seek to subserve is most glorious and most holy. Give, therefore, to it with an unsparing hand. Remember your accountability to God for the blessings, both spiritual and temporal, wherewith he hath blessed you; and, “as every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.” *Amen.*

For the Christian Journal  
City Churches.

MR. J. WEEDEN, of this city, has recently published, on a large sheet, “A Summary View of the Houses for Public Worship in the City and County of New-York, A. D. 1828, showing the Local Situation of each, what Denomination they belong to, when Founded, when Enlarged, when Burnt, when Rebuilt, &c. together with the Dimensions of each Building in square feet, what Materials they are built of, Names of the presiding Ministers, &c. &c. To which is added, A Brief History of all the houses that have gone to decay, pulled down, or converted to other uses, since the settlement of the Colony.”

Believing that it will be interesting to our readers, we subjoin that portion of it which relates to our own church.

Title.	Situation.	Dimensions.	F.	En.	B't.	Re-b't.	Materials.	Sq. feet.	Ministers.
Trinity, <sup>a</sup>	Broadway op. Wall,	74 by 101	1696	1733	1776	1788	Stone,	7474	No Minister.
Du St. Esprit,	Pine b. William & Nassau,	50 “ 70	1704	1741			Stone,	3500	
St. George's,	Beekman cor. Cliff,	72 “ 104	1755		1814	1816	Stone,	6890	James Milnor.
St. Paul's,	Broadway b. Fulton & Vesey,	72 “ 113	1766				Stone,	8136	
St. Mark's,	Stuyvesant, b. 2d & 3d Avenue,	66 “ 100	1799				Stone,	6380	Wm. Creighton.
Zion, <sup>c</sup>	Mott cor. Cross,	64 “ 80	1801		1815	1817	Stone,	5120	Thos. Breintnall.
St. Stephen's,	Chrystie c. Broome,	54 “ 75	1805				Stone,	4054	Henry J. Fekus.
St. John's,	Varick b. Beach & Laight,	73 “ 111	1807				Stone,	8103	
St. Michael's,	Bloomington,	36 “ 53	1807				Wood,	1908	Wm. Richmond.
Grace,	Broadway. Rector,	63 “ 113	1808				Brick,	6606	J. M. Wainwright.
St. James's,	Hamilton-square,	40 “ 70	1810				Wood,	2800	Wm. Richmond.
St. Philip's,	Collect b. Anthony & Leonard,	60 “ 60	1819		1821	1822	Brick,	3000	Peter Williams.
St. Luke's,	Hudson b. Barrow & Christopher,	48 “ 66	1821				Brick,	3168	Levi S. Ives.
Christ,	Anthony b. Broadway & Church-st.	64 “ 90	1823				Stone,	5760	Thomas Lyell.
St. Mary's,	Manhattanville,	37 “ 48	1825				Wood,	1776	No Minister.
All Saints, <sup>d</sup>	Grand intersection Division,	25 “ 60	1825				Wood,	1500	Wm. A. Clark.
St. Thomas',	Broadway c. Houston,	62 “ 113	1826				Stone,	7006	George Upfold.

"<sup>a</sup> This church, in conjunction with St. Paul's and St. John's chapels, is supplied by John Henry Hobart,\* bishop of the diocese, and three assistants, viz. William Berrian, Benjamin T. Onderdonk, and John F. Schröder.

"<sup>b</sup> This house was erected by a society of French Protestants, who fled from persecution after the revocation edict of Nantz. In 1803, the minister and the congregation conformed to the Protestant Episcopal Church, and were taken into that connexion.

"<sup>c</sup> This building was erected by a congregation of Lutherans, and remained in that connexion till 1810, and then was received into union with the Episcopal Church.

"<sup>d</sup> This building was intended only as a temporary chapel; and will soon be superseded by the stone church, now erecting in Henry-street."<sup>†</sup>

Under the head of "*Ministers (over and above what is mentioned in the body of this work) who reside in New-York,*" are the following:—

"*Episcopalians.*—William Harris, president, and John M<sup>c</sup>Vicar, professor, in Columbia college; Samuel H. Turner, and Bird Wilson, professors in the Theological Seminary; William R. Whittingham, librarian of the Theological Seminary, and chaplain of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Public School; Edmund D. Griffin, assistant minister of St. Michael's and St. James's churches; ‡ Manton Eastburn, rector of the church of the Ascension, (worshipping at present in the French church; § Edmund D. Barry, (officiating at Jersey City,) and Augustus Fitch, teachers; Cave Jones, § chaplain in the United States' Navy; John Grigg, officiating at Williamsburgh, Long-Island; William Hammel, David Brown, || and William A. Curtis."<sup>¶</sup>

\* The usual titles of the clergy are uniformly omitted in this work.—*Ed. C. J.*

† The church has since been finished and consecrated.—*Ed. C. J.*

‡ Mr. Griffin's connexion with these churches has since ceased.—*Ed. C. J.*

§ This is a mistake. Mr. Jones resides at Brooklyn.—*Ed. C. J.*

|| Mr. Brown has since removed to Albany.—*Ed. C. J.*

¶ Mr. Curtis has since removed to Connecticut.—*Ed. C. J.*

Under the head of "*Houses become Extinct,*" is the following notice:—

"I begin with the King's chapel, (so called,) founded in 1642. This house, (the first of the kind ever built in this city,) was erected by the Dutch inhabitants, and located in Fort Amsterdam, near the Bowling-Green,\* where the Dutch inhabitants worshipped, till the erection of the church in Garden-street, the site of which was objected to, at that period, as too distant from the centre of population. After the surrender of the colony to the British, in 1664, the English also worshipped in the chapel of the fort, and in this way it became an Episcopal establishment. This building was burnt down by accident, in the year 1741, during the Negro Plot."

Among "*Houses now Building,*" is mentioned "one Episcopal, called All Saints', in Henry-street, corner of Scammel, of stone, 64 by 90, William A. Clark, minister."<sup>\*</sup>

We are happy to be able to say, that since the above statement was made out, another Episcopal church, (the church of the Ascension) has been commenced, and is in progress.

The following paragraph closes this really interesting, and we believe, generally correct, document:—

"From a comparative view of the city, at two distinct periods, namely, 1823 and 1828, (say five years,) it appears that the number of places for public worship has not kept pace with the increasing population; for, if it required eighty-one houses, in 1823, to accommodate 130,000 inhabitants, it would require one hundred and twelve houses, in 1828, to contain 180,000, the supposed population, whereas we number only one hundred and one. However, as many of the new houses which have been erected are of larger dimensions, the disproportion will not appear so great, on calculating the aggregate of square feet which they cover."

From the data afforded by Mr. Weedon's Summary, we have made a calculation, which we believe to be cor-

\* This church has since been completed and consecrated.—*Ed. C. J.*



rect, as to the sufficiency of the places of worship in this city for its present population. The result is, that all the present places of worship, of all denominations, cannot accommodate 82,000 persons. Taking, then, the population to be 180,000, there remain 98,000 persons in this city unprovided with the means of the public worship, instructions, and ordinances of religion—a population far exceeding that of all Long-Island, and at least equal, it is believed, to that of any other two of the most populous counties in the state. Surely this is a fact which ought to excite the attention of all who value that worship, and those instructions and ordinances. It ought, more especially, to be laid to heart by the members of our own church, which justly claims the distinction of presenting religion in the purest and most scriptural form; and in one proportionably well calculated to secure and extend the blessed influences of the Gospel. Such a mass of human beings, congregated in a large city, and therefore peculiarly exposed to the degrading and destructive consequences of vice and immorality, and from their necessary intercourse with a widely spread surrounding country, largely extending those consequences; and yet destitute of the only sufficient counteraction afforded in the public services and instructions of religion; must excite the sympathy and the alarm of every true friend to the glory of God, the good of the community, and the spiritual and eternal welfare of man. Large cities have a direct tendency to strengthen, by concentrating, the pernicious influence of irreligion and of vice. Every friend, therefore, to piety and good morals, must desire that no effort should be untried to provide that only sufficient remedy which is afforded by the institutions of the Christian religion. Experience, too, has shown that churches of our communion, judiciously located, and served by pious, devoted, and well qualified pastors, will soon realize large and flourishing congregations; and proportionably increase the spiritual blessings of the community. And experience, if we be not weary in well-doing, will still evince the same. We have

just had the pleasure of welcoming the new and increasing parish of All Saints', in their large and substantial house of prayer. In due time, the church of the Ascension may be expected to be added to our number. But what are they among so many? Our population is rapidly increasing. Its existing amount requires more churches. Its increase adds emphasis to the too seasonable exhortation to the members of our communion—*Go on*—Do what you can, to make God's voice heard in all parts of the city, through the word, worship, and ordinances, which he has established in his Church; and to interest all orders of men in that pure and holy religion of the Gospel which is the only sufficient mean of public welfare and security.

---

*For the Christian Journal.*

#### REMINISCENCES—No. V.

*Extracts from Humphrey's History of the Society (in England) for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.*

"NEW-YORK government is next; this worthy people showed an early zeal for having the church of England worship established among them. In the year 1693, an act was passed for settling the church of England service in some counties, and a provision appointed for six ministers, one for the city of New York, the capital of the country, and the rest for other principal towns. But this act did not take effect till about the year 1702, nor was the provision made thereby, a sufficient maintenance for the ministers in the country towns: these applied to the society for help; particularly the inhabitants of West-Chester were very pressing for a minister. Earnest memorials were sent from the inhabitants of New-Rochelle, from those of Jamaica, and Hempstead, towns on Long-Island; from Staten-Island, and from Rye; and their desires have been complied with, and missionaries sent to those places.

"The chief inhabitants of Burlington showed a very early affection for the church of England worship, which

they have continued down to the present time inviolable. In 1704, they wrote to the society, 'That they had a very deep sense of the happiness of having religion settled among them; they desired to adore the goodness of God for moving the hearts of the lords spiritual and temporal, the nobles and gentry, to enter into a Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the benefit of which they had already experienced, and hoped further to enjoy. They had joined in subscription to build a church, which, though not yet near finished, they had heard several sermons in it; but they were not able to maintain a minister without the assistance of the society, whereon they begged God to shower his blessings as a reward for their great charity and care for the good of souls.' The vestry wrote a letter to the same effect to Bishop Compton, entreating his lordship's favour, and returning their humble thanks for his care of them.

"Colonel Morris, a gentleman of character and considerable interest in New-Jersey, did, in a letter, in the year 1703, very earnestly solicit Dr. Beveridge, (late Bishop of St. Asaph,) a member of this society, to recommend it to the society, to send a missionary to Monmouth county, in East-Jersey, where a considerable body of people had formed themselves into a gathered church, and had promised all the help their narrow circumstances could afford their minister. The society were not then able to support a missionary there. But the Rev. Mr. Alexander Innis, happening to be in those parts, took the care of that people upon him. After a worthy discharge of his function for some years, he died; upon which the justices of the peace, the high sheriff, and grand jury of Monmouth county, did represent to the society, in the year 1717—'That the worthy and Rev. Mr. Alexander Innis, by unwearied pains and industry, gathered three congregations in this county, though much scattered in their habitations; yet did he visit them, teach them, and instruct them all, once at least in three weeks, in order to their eternal happiness. But alas! since his death, we have been without the

means of grace, unhappy in the want of a minister of the established church to officiate in that office, and to instruct the youth in the Church Catechism. For want of this, we find that some are tossed too and fro, and too many count that they are not bound by our holy religion, but at full liberty to do what may seem good in their own eyes, which hath a wretched influence on their morals; and we are much afraid, that if a narrow search were made, such would make up a great bulk, among near 400 families in this county; therefore, that the public worship of Almighty God may be maintained in that order, and according to those excellent rules established in the church of England, we humbly pray that your honourable body would think of us, and send over one to help us, (Acts xvi. 9,) for such are our circumstances, that we cannot in this case help ourselves.'

"The society received the following very serious and pathetic letter from the inhabitants of Salem, in West New-Jersey, and the parts adjacent, in the year 1722:—'Very venerable gentlemen—A poor unhappy people, settled by God's providence to procure by laborious industry a subsistence for our families, make bold to apply ourselves to God, through that very pious and charitable society, his happy instruments to disperse his blessings in these remote parts; that as his goodness hath vouchsafed us a moderate support for our bodies, his Holy Spirit may influence you to provide us with spiritual food for our souls: in this case our indigence is excessive, and our destitution deplorable, having never been so blessed as to have a person settled among us to dispense the august ordinances of religion; insomuch, that even the name of it is almost lost among us; the virtue and energy of it over men's lives almost expiring, we wont say forgotten, for that implies previous knowledge of it. But how should people know, having learned so little of God, and his worship? And how can they learn without a teacher? Our condition is truly lamentable, and deserving Christian compassion. And to whom can we apply ourselves, but to that ve-

nerable corporation whose zeal for the propagation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ hath preserved so many in these colonies from irreligion, profaneness, and infidelity? We beseech you, therefore, in the name of our common Lord and Master, and gracious Redeemer, and for the sake of the Gospel, (just ready to die among us) to make us partakers of that bounty to these parts; and, according to the motto engraven on your seal, *Transeuntes adjuvate, nos (penè Infideles,)* be pleased to send us some reverend clergyman, according to your wisdom, who may inform our judgments by preaching to us the truths of the Gospel; and recover us all, aged and young, out of the miserable corruptions consequent to a gross ignorance of it; to whom we promise all encouragement according to our abilities, and all due respect and obedience to his office, instructions, and person. The Lord in mercy look upon us, and excite you, according to your wonted piety, to have a compassionate regard of our case; and we pray the great God to prosper all your pious undertakings, to promote his glory and the good of his church, especially in this destitute place of the pilgrimage of your most dutiful servants, &c.

"The society were moved by this plain and sincere letter, and soon after sent, and have continued ever since, a missionary there.

"The last government, New-England, though, as hath been remarked before, provided with an Independent and Presbyterian ministry, yet had great numbers of inhabitants who could not follow that persuasion, but were exceeding desirous of worshipping God after the manner of the church of England. I shall give the reader a few petitions from congregations of people in this government, which show plainly the society did not concern themselves here till they were loudly called upon; and that the inhabitants in many places *did not only send petitions for ministers, but also built churches before they had any ministers*; which is an uncontrollable evidence and proof, that the people themselves desired to have the church of England worship with a hearty zeal and true sincerity.

"In September, 1702, the church-wardens of Rhode-Island wrote to the society—"That they cannot forbear expressing their great joy in being under the patronage of so honourable a corporation, through whose pious endeavours, with God's assistance, the church of England hath so fair a prospect of flourishing in those remote parts of the world, and among the rest of her small branches, their's also in Rhode-Island; that though it is not four years since they began to assemble themselves together to worship God after the manner of the church of England, yet have they built them a church, finished all on the outside, and the inside is pewed well, though not beautiful; and whatsoever favours the society shall bestow upon them towards the promoting of their church, shall be received with the humblest gratitude, and seconded with the utmost of their abilities."

"The bishop of London (Dr. Compton) received at the same time petitions for ministers from Rhode-Island, from Naragansett, from Newbury, a church in New-Hampshire, from Little Compton and Tiverton, from Braintree, near Boston, and from Stratford, in Connecticut. The case of these two last towns was also further recommended to the society's care by gentlemen of considerable figure and interest. Colonel Morris pressed very earnestly for a minister for Braintree, and Colonel Heathcote for another for the people of Connecticut colony; great numbers of whom were very earnest to have a minister of the church of England. Robert Hunter, esq. governor of New-York, in the year 1711, writes thus to the society concerning the people at Stratford:—"When I was at Connecticut, those of our communion at the church at Stratford, came to me in a body; and then, as they have since by letter, begged my intercession with the venerable society, and the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, for a missionary; they appeared very much in earnest, and are the best set of men I met with in that country."

"The inhabitants of Marblehead, in the year 1714, sent the following petition to the society, which speaks the

hearty disposition of the people when they set up the church of England worship; and this, upon the proof of many years experience, appears plainly to have been no sudden heat or start of zeal, but a well grounded sense of the excellency of our church, since they have continued in the same spirit ever since. They express themselves thus to the society—'Whereas your petitioners, out of a just esteem for the excellent constitution of the church of England, both in its doctrine and discipline, and form of government, have subscribed sufficient sums of money towards the erecting of a building for the service of Almighty God, according to the manner of worship prescribed in the church of England; your petitioners humbly desire the honourable society's favour and encouragement in sending a minister to them with all convenient speed, with the usual salary allowed their missionaries. Of what consideration your petitioners are, will be seen by the number of their names, and the value of their subscriptions, underwritten; we must also add, that the town of Marblehead (next Boston) is the greatest place of trade and commerce within this province, daily adding to their numbers persons chiefly of the church of England, and, by the blessing of God, we have a certain prospect, that the church here will be every day increased, and flourish more and more. Upon these accounts, we hope the venerable society will be pleased to grant our requests, and your petitioners shall always pray for the society's prosperity and success in all their great and glorious designs.'

"It must be noted here, the people did fully perform what they promised; and the sum intimated in their petition for building of a church, was no less than £416, subscribed by 45 persons, and the people have continued constant to this present time in their firm adherence to the church of England."

From the Amulet.

### *The Hero of the Coliseum.*

(Concluded from page 177.)

THE day of festival at length arrived. Sunrise beheld what, to a modern, must appear inconceivable—

eighty thousand citizens congregated in that stupendous building, which, lined with marble, decorated with statues, replete with all that luxury could invent, or wealth, the wealth of a world, command, was devoted to purposes more base and barbarous than the wars of savages.

The first day elapsed in diversions which usually prefaced the introduction of the gladiators. Hunters despatched wild beasts—wild beasts tore their hunters—and animals, brought from all parts of the Roman empire, differing in size and ferocity, were matched against each other. The arena, contrived to exhibit a change of scenes, represented on this occasion a vast desert, which acquired a frightful reality from the roaring of the combatants, native as it seemed to the spot, whilst the sand, with which it was profusely strewn, tended to heighten the illusion. But its sparkling surface was soon stained with blood; and long before the conclusion of the conflicts, severed limbs, and mangled bodies, both of men and animals, lay scattered amongst the artificial rocks and thickets. On the day following the arena assumed a new form. The desert, with its howling inhabitants and frightful carnage, was removed, and a scene substituted in its stead, equally perfect, and in its first aspect, more pleasing. Part of what had appeared a barren plain, was, by means of water conveyed through subterraneous pipes, converted into a winding river, which, with a colony of rude huts, backed by a dark and far extending forest, suggested to the audience the country of their Gothic foes.

Clad only in a linen tunic, their long hair gathered into a knot at the top of the head, and unarmed, with the exception of a short sword, and small round buckler, two young warriors of the Alemanni slowly advanced to the front of the arena. They were captives, who had been taken in the late war, and were reserved, with many others, for the present occasion. The approach of the victims was hailed by a shout of applause, painfully contrasted with the sadness of their deportment. They placed themselves on opposite sides of the arena, and ex-



pectation hushed the waiting thousands. For some time, the unfortunate opponents exhibited only the harmless play of fencers; not from any dread of death, and still less of pain, but from a mutual and noble disinclination to slay a countryman and brother in arms. But the watchful audience soon perceived and resented the skill which avoided wounds, and with threats and expressions of contempt, commanded them to close. The devoted pair retreated a few steps backwards, cast a glance of unutterable scorn on the glittering ranks of their savage lords, and sprang vehemently forwards, each with the same desire, to throw himself on the sword of the other. One of them succeeded but too well, and sunk, mortally wounded, at the feet of his unwilling conqueror.

"He leans upon his hand—his manly brow  
Consents to death, but conquers agony,  
And his droop'd head sinks gradually low—  
And through his side the last drops, ebbing  
slow

From the red gash, fall heavily, one by one,  
Like the first of a thunder-shower; and now  
The arena swims around him—he is gone,  
Ere e'en the inhuman shout which hail'd the  
one who won.

He heard it, but he heeded not—his eyes  
Were with his heart, and that was far away;  
He recked not of the life he lost, nor prize;  
But where his rude hut by the Danube lay,  
There were his rude barbarians all at play,  
There was their Dacian mother—he, their  
sire,

Butchered to make a Roman holiday.—  
All this rush'd with his blood."

But the last hour in which these spectacles were to outrage humanity was at hand; and a humble monk of the desert was destined to achieve what emperors had been unequal to.

On the morning of the second day of the games, Telemachus, to the consternation of Hilarion, announced it as his intention to repair to the Coliseum, there, to make an appeal to the people; and, if needful, descend at all hazards into the arena, and separate the gladiators:—a desperate, or, as Hilarion termed it, "a presumptuous enterprize," but which, judging by results, we may term the inspiration of heroism.

That worthy father put forth a long list of dissuaves; he represented the unseemliness of the place for an ancho-

rite, enlarged on the probability of danger, the certainty of disappointment, and strengthened his arguments by the authority of every saint and angel then extant—but all in vain.

Telemachus mildly repeated his resolution, and patiently explained the motives by which he was actuated, not one of which was intelligible to Hilarion's less fervent spirit.—"Marvelous! marvellous!" ejaculated the poor monk, in a tone, and with a countenance, of unutterable perplexity and dismay.—"Yes, good brother, of a surety one ought to love one's neighbours as one's self—but running headlong into death and danger, is not loving one's self at all. Can you not pray quietly in your cell, for the deliverance of these unfortunate beings who are forced to run each other through for pastime?—and can you not preach against the sin and shame of blood-thirstiness, when you are safe in some pulpit?—but, oh! marvellous! marvellous! to think of going down into the arena, and provoking eighty thousand people in a breath! St. Anthony truly preached to the fishes—but, oh! brother!—brother!—you are going to preach to wild beasts!"

"Hilarion," replied Telemachus, with a sweet, if somewhat mournful, smile, "our thoughts take different paths on this point; and to the outward eye, your's is the straightest and easiest to follow; but there is that within my heart which urges me onwards, and gives me good hope of success, although between it and me, there lies, perchance, a painful death. And now, dear brother Hilarion, farewell; and, seeing you cannot alter my determination, which, believe me, has not been formed on sudden or vainglorious thoughts—grant me one favour:—return with all speed to our own homely dwelling, for it is *not* good either for soul or body to stay where you are; and I would not our brethren should have cause to charge us with fickleness of purpose. Sometimes visit the palm-grove, Hilarion: I have found it oft a sweet and sacred place; and have a special care of the destitute mourners who resort to the monastery—some of whom may inquire for Telemachus."

With these words, and a fervently-bestowed benediction, he wrapped his cloak round him, and, taking his staff, set forth on his way, with the steady step and serious aspect of one who feels that he has undertaken a great work, from the execution of which he may never return.

He reached the Coliseum just before the gladiator's death. The exulting shouts which then broke from the collected thousands stunned him with affright; and for a moment, his heart recoiled from its noble purpose; but a second glance at the manly form bleeding before his eyes, by appealing to his sympathy, invigorated his courage. There was not, however, time for deliberation. To the first, succeeded a second pair of combatants; and as their encounter commenced with energy, they were hailed with corresponding applause. At that moment—calmly, cheerfully, determinately, with his life in his hand, and the spirit of Christianity strong in his heart—Telemachus descended into the arena—interposed between the astonished gladiators, and, in the presence of assembled Rome, denounced the sin, the cruelty, and the cowardice of such amusements. Simple amazement at the interruption prevented, for some moments, the exhibition of any other sentiment; but as Telemachus, gathering energy by exertion, proceeded to make a pathetic appeal to the emperor, whose merciful inclinations were no secret to the multitude—rage at the intruder's audacity, and fear that he might prevail, succeeded. The numberless entrances and passages to the amphitheatre, so exquisitely contrived, that the whole of this vast assemblage could collect and disperse with incredible ease and celerity, hastened the fate of their intended victim. As if the same resolution had, in the same instant, been formed by each, hundreds and thousands simultaneously rushed from their seats into the neighbouring streets, and in a few minutes returned to them again, laden with whatever missiles they had been able to collect. Their infuriated shouts, and menacing gestures, announced to Telemachus the doom he had anticipated. Making a signal to the gladiators to re-

tire from the arena, he sank upon his knees, not to implore mercy of man, but to commend his spirit to God; and, with folded arms, and head bowed meekly upon his breast, awaited and received that shower of stones which dismissed him to his rest—the noble martyr of humanity!

Wonderful revolutions of feeling have sometimes taken place in popular assemblies; and that effected in the present instance was not more striking than it is authentic. Shame, remorse, and sorrow, succeeded to murderous rage; the destroyers bestowed funeral honours on their victim; and when, immediately afterwards, Honorius decreed the abolition of gladiatorial shows, they yielded an unresisting obedience.

It has been esteemed matter of regret, that, amongst the benefactors of the human race, neither shrine, nor statue, has been erected to Telemachus—a vain and needless feeling, since, while a single stone remains, the COLISEUM itself is his monument.

M. J. J.

---

*Address of the Right Rev. Bishop White to the late Convention of Pennsylvania.*

Brethren, the Clerical and the Lay Members of this Convention,

IMMEDIATELY after the last convention, held in Harrisburg, I repaired to the city of Lancaster, where, on the 13th of May, I held a confirmation, and preached; the rector, the Rev. Mr. Ives, reading prayers.

On Saturday, the 19th of the same month, I consecrated St. Mary's church, in Hamiltonville, Philadelphia county.

On the 30th of the same month, I ordained William R. Bowman to the priesthood.

From Tuesday, the 26th of June, to Friday, the 29th of the same month, I was engaged in New-York on the concerns of the General Theological Seminary, presiding at the meetings of the trustees, and at the commencement, attending to the examinations, and delivering an address. In the minds of the bishops, and of the other clerical and the lay trustees present, there was renewed satisfaction on witnessing the talents of the professors, with the attainments of the graduates, and of the other students.

During my stay, there was held the first annual meeting of the Episcopal Sunday

School Society, instituted by deputies to the last General Convention immediately after their adjournment. At their meeting in New-York, measures were adopted to render the design efficient; and I embrace the present opportunity of recommending it to the patronage of the diocese, as fruitful of many advantages—among which it is not the least, that a check may be expected to be thus provided, against endeavours perseveringly put forth, to introduce into our Sunday schools an influence alien from that of the church. There is now in this city an agent of the society, a very respectable deacon of our church, sent for the special purpose of raising contributions; and I cannot but wish that his endeavours may be successful.

On Sunday, the 8th of July, I consecrated St. John's church, in the borough of Carlisle, administering the rite of confirmation, and preaching forenoon and afternoon; the Rev. Joseph Spencer, the rector, reading prayers.

On Sunday, the 26th of August, I ordained to the noly office of priests, Henry J. Whitehouse, and John B. Clarkson; both being of this diocese.

On Thursday, the 25th of October, in Christ church, of this city, I consecrated to the episcopacy the Rev. Henry Ustick Onderdonk, D. D., elected by the last convention to be assistant bishop of this diocese, and to be my successor in the event of my decease, there having been previously presented to me the testimonials required by the canons. The bishops present and assisting were, Bishop Hobart, of New-York; Bishop Kemp, of Maryland; Bishop Croes, of New-Jersey, and Bishop Bowen, of South-Carolina. The sermon having been demanded by the consecration service, and the preacher having been designated by me, I hold myself bound to declare my abhorrence of the calumnies to which he became subject by his compliance with my request.

Early in the year 1811, within a short time of the election of Dr. Hobart to the episcopacy of New-York, and with the view of defeating that object, there appeared, in a printed pamphlet, sundry statements injurious to his character. Before the publishing of any counter statements, he was elected to the episcopacy by a large majority of the clergy, and of the lay deputies of the diocese, under knowledge of the charges, and with conviction of the untruth of them. That very respectable corporation, the vestry of Trinity church, indignant at the treatment of one of their pastors, took measures which affected the pecuniary interests of the accuser, and his standing within their parochial connexion. The case came, in canonical form, before Bishop Benjamin

Moore, and the other clergy of the diocese. Their decision was unequivocally in favour of the vestry, with whose cause the character of Bishop Hobart had become identified. The defeated party brought the matter before the supreme court of the state, the judges of which, with the consent of the parties, condescended to act in the character of referees; and by their decision, the act of the bishop and clergy, comprehending a justification of Bishop Hobart, was confirmed. But, after the lapse of 16 years, the statements have been revived, without the least reference to the decision of the bishop and clergy, or to the award of the judges, or to the counter statements, to which, to this day, there has not been a reply. The present notice of the calumnies is not the suggestion of private friendship, however felt and cherished for a Right Rev. Brother, but an act of justice to him, and an imperious duty on my part, because of injury sustained by him in consequence of a service performed for this diocese, at my request, made in pursuance of the rubric.

As a part of this address, I deliver the instrument of the consecration of Bishop Onderdonk to be entered on your journal.

#### *Sentence of Consecration.*

Know all men by these presents, that we, William White, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania, Presiding Bishop; John Henry Hobart, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York; James Kemp, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Maryland; John Croes, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-Jersey; and Nathaniel Bowen, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of South-Carolina, under the protection of Almighty God, in Christ church, in the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday, the twenty-fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven, did then, and there, rightly and canonically, consecrate our beloved in Christ, Henry Ustick Onderdonk, D. D., rector of St. Ann's church, Brooklyn, New-York, of whose sufficiency in good learning, soundness in the faith, and purity of manners, we were fully ascertained, into the office of bishop, to which he hath been elected by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania, to assist the bishop of the church in the said state in the duties of the episcopal office, and to succeed him in case of survivorship.

Given in the city of Philadelphia, this twenty-fifth day of October, in the

year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven.

WILLIAM WHITE, (L. S.)  
JOHN HENRY HOBART, (L. S.)  
JAMES KEMP, (L. S.)  
JOHN CROES, (L. S.)  
NATHANIEL BOWEN, (L. S.)

On the 30th December, I ordained John P. Robinson, of the diocese of Delaware, to the office of a deacon.

On the 23d of March, in the African church of St. Thomas, in this city, at the desire of the standing committee of the diocese of Maryland, I ordained to the holy office of Priests, William Levington, a coloured man, settled in the city of Baltimore. In recording this act, induced by the lamentable death of a Right Rev. Brother, I trust, that as the event was the result of his having been one of the agents in the consecration of an assistant bishop for this diocese, I shall be indulged in the expression of the poignant grief excited in me by the melancholy occasion. My knowledge of Bishop Kemp, and my friendly regards for him, were of a duration not far short of forty years. By the imposition of my hands, at an early period of his life, he was ordained deacon and priest; and by the same, nearly fourteen years ago, he was consecrated a bishop. These circumstances, and others, gave occasion to considerable intercourse between us; during the whole of which, such were the evidences in him of unostentatious piety, with a disposition eminently friendly, and without the least mixture of guile; so happily was this part of his character united with solid learning, under the direction of a discriminating judgment; and so efficiently were these and other endowments applied by him to the good of the church, by a steady but temperate zeal, that, having formerly esteemed his election to the episcopacy a blessing to the communion, I now mourn its being deprived of him as a heavy loss. In consideration of the circumstances under which the event took place, I trust that it will be held the duty of every one of us to put up his petitions to the throne of grace, that our sister diocese may be provided with a successor worthy of replacing a bishop whose services they duly estimate, and whose memory they will affectionately cherish.

The Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania has lately been favoured with a considerable increase in the number of annual subscribers. At present it employs four missionaries, and will add to the number as soon as the services of suitable persons can be obtained.

My confirmations have been of fifty-seven persons. The number confirmed by

Bishop Onderdonk will be reported by him.

The changes in our ministry have been as follows:—The Rev. Josiah G. Cooper, reported in my last address as principal of an academy in Germantown, has resigned that station, and is a resident teacher in this city. The Rev. Henry H. Pfeiffer is credibly reported to be the rector of Christ church, Brownsville, in place of the Rev. John P. Bausman, who is removed to the diocese of Ohio. The Rev. William Chaderton has removed to the diocese of New-Jersey. The Rev. Levi S. Ives has removed to that of New-York. The Rev. Moses P. Bennet is credibly reported to have left this diocese. The Rev. Samuel Bowman has removed from Pequea, and accepted the co-rectorship of St. James's church, Lancaster, and his place in Pequea, according to credible report, has been supplied by the choice of the Rev. John B. Clemson, formerly of Harrisburg. To the church in that borough, the Rev. John W. Curtis, transferred to this diocese from that of New-York, has been elected. The Rev. Benjamin P. Aydelott has removed to the diocese of Ohio. The Rev. John V. E. Thorn has resigned his church in Bristol, and is resident in Carlisle, and his place is supplied by the Rev. William H. Rees. The Rev. Robert Piggott has resigned the rectorship of the church in Lewistown. The Rev. William Eldred is deceased. The Rev. Norman Nash has discontinued the connexion reported in the last address; but is still resident in the diocese. Of the Rev. Robert Davis, I have not sufficient information to report whether his absence be temporary or a final removal. The Rev. Benjamin Hutchins, in the service of the Society for the Advancement of Christianity, has been transferred from the north-west to the north-east section of the state. The Rev. William Bryant has been transferred to this diocese from that of New-Jersey. The Rev. Peter Van Pelt, transferred to this diocese from that of South-Carolina, is ministering to the African church of St. Thomas, in this city. The Rev. Richard S. Mason has been transferred to this diocese, from that of North-Carolina; and the Rev. Thomas G. Allen, from that of Maryland. The following deacons have been transferred to this diocese from the dioceses to be respectively named. The Rev. George Mintzer, from Ohio, settled at Morlaton; the Rev. John A. Hicks, from New-York, settled at Easton; and the Rev. Bennet Glover, from Connecticut, engaged as a missionary by the Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania. The Rev. Ralph Williston has been transferred to this diocese from that of Delaware. He became and continues a missionary in the



service of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. The case of the Rev. William H. Bowman is worthy of the consideration of the convention. If he should appear and claim a seat, they will of course be judges of a membership of their body. But if I am correct in the supposition, that as well his residence, as his cure, is at Francisville, in Louisiana, I ought not at present to consider him as a clergyman of this diocese, and therefore have not delivered his name to your secretary. To the opinion expressed, it may be objected, that a clergyman, situated as Mr. Bowman, in the case of evil living, would not be responsible to any ecclesiastical tribunal. To my mind, this only proves, that there is a possible evil not provided against by our General Convention, although unquestionably competent to it.

Since preparing this address, I was credibly informed yesterday, that Mr. George Kirk, whom, in the last year, I reported as residing at Downing's Town, is now officiating at St. John's church, New-London.

The candidates for orders since the last address are, George P. Giddinge, John W. James, William Hilton, David Dick, Francis H. L. Laird, Matthew H. Henderson, Frederick Beasley, and R. A. Henderson; the last named being transferred from Delaware.

Nathan Stem, reported last year, has been transferred to Ohio. The number of those who may now be considered candidates is fifteen.

It is to be hoped that the instituting of the Episcopal Sunday School Society, seated in New-York, but co-extensive with the United States, will not be thought to supersede the necessity of our Diocesan Sunday School Society, now become auxiliary to the other. That of the diocese has still before it a considerable and permanent work in providing our Sunday schools with tracts and books, and in guarding against extraneous agencies.

The Female Tract Society continues their exertions. They have published within the last year nine valuable tracts, for which their expenditure has been \$464 16; and they respectfully inquire, why this useful institution, which has been deemed by the Society for the Advancement of Christianity an important coadjutor, is not more encouraged.

The Education Society is still in its beginnings. It has, however, gathered the small funded stock of \$1,028 44, the interest of which, with the annual subscriptions, supports three beneficiaries. This society has been materially aided by female associations in four of the churches in the city.

The fund for the support of the widows and the children of deceased clergymen, who, during their lives, had contributed

to it—for none others can transmit claims to their families—has increased to \$40,595 33. The few contributors are providing returns for such of their families as may survive them, far beyond proportion to what will have been contributed by the deceased husbands and fathers. That the benefit will not be more extensive, will not be ascribed to your bishop, in his not proposing of it to his reverend brethren in his annual addresses. He is apprehensive, that the fewness of the contributors will always endanger there being efforts for the diverting of the produce of this fund, to the gratifying of the impulses of a mistaken charity. He had no hand in the formation of the society, it having been formed when he was a youth, and a few years before his entrance on the ministry; but, at the time, he had opportunities of knowing the pains bestowed on it, especially in the obtaining of correct principles of calculation, warranted by extensive observation of duration of lives. After the shock received by the fund from the currency of the revolutionary war, he became much occupied, jointly with a reverend brother\* now present, not only in re-organizing the society, but also in rescuing the remnant of the fund from the further danger into which it had fallen. In consequence, he holds himself entitled to record on your minutes his caution against whatever may deprive any clergyman of this diocese of the right to purchase for his family an interest in this fund, not only proportionable to his contributions, according to the calculations of what are called the chances of life, but also admitting addition proportioned to the increase of the fund.

The Executive Committee of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, after having laboured under much discouragement, perceive a brightening of their prospects. While they were entertaining the opinion, that their efficiency was in full proportion to their means, they were labouring under the imputation of the want of zeal and of exertion. For the amount of what they have performed, they are not backward to appeal to a comparison of it with their supplies. The suspension of the Green-Bay mission is a subject of deep regret with them, but was the result of causes which the committee sought in vain to obviate. There will soon be a revival of the mission, under the encouragement of expected aid from the federal government. This, with supplies lately received, beyond any within the same space of time, encourage the committee to a renewal, and to an increase of their exertions.

Of societies not known in our institutions, the only one that can properly be

\* The Rev. Dr. Blackwell.

noticed in this address, on principles heretofore detailed, is the Bible Society of Philadelphia. It continues to be deservedly cherished by the members of our church generally, who, it is to be hoped, will appreciate and aid in the great work now in progress, of providing every destitute family in the state with a Bible; to be received as they may choose, either gratuitously, or at a reduced price.

It is highly gratifying to your bishop, that he can present an encouraging account of the fund provided for the support of the Right Rev. his assistant and successor. The amount of what has been raised in the few congregations in which there has been compliance with recommendations to the effect, according to the last statement of the account of the treasurer, is \$12,064 57. It is in the United States' 6 per cent. stock, and in the management of three trustees, under the direction of the standing committee.

The generous bequest of the late Rev. Dr. Pilmore was mentioned in the last annual address as pending in law. The supreme court of the commonwealth have adjudged it, in trust, for the use declared by the testator, to our incorporated Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania; a result to which no hindrance was interposed by the executors of the deceased, further than was necessary for their security. The entire proceeds of the bequest are, in 6 per cent. United States' stock, \$7,969 12. These two funds are to be permanently applied to the support of the episcopacy, and amount to somewhat upwards of \$20,000. The part of the fund, purchased by the legacy of Dr. Pilmore, will necessarily be in the custody of the said society, and to be governed by the will of the reverend donor.

In addition to what has been stated, it has been the effect of the public spirit of sundry members of our church, that they have raised among themselves, on loan without interest, a sum which has purchased in public funds to the amount of \$30,851 85. The loan is to be repaid by the collections to be gathered in the churches. Any further than as it may be so repaid, it will cease with the episcopacy of Bishop Onderdonk. In the mean time, the stock is under management of a committee appointed by the lenders.

While this subject is before the convention, it may be proper to mention, that the property purchased with the legacy of Mr. Doz, and the receipt of the proceeds of it, are continued under the circumstances detailed in former addresses.

Your bishop finds himself under considerable difficulty in making out a correct list of the clergy of the diocese, and of the cures to which they are respectively attached, owing in sundry instances to

the neglect of sending to him official information of the periods of the commencements and of the dissolutions of pastoral connexions. It is one of the evils resulting from the neglect, that a clergyman, for the accomplishment of an improper object, may be entered as occupying a station in one of our churches, when his relation to it has ceased, and he has accepted a charge in another diocese. If there should be any inaccuracy in the detail, which has been made of the changes in our ministry, it will probably be found owing to the neglect now complained of.

This address will be followed by a supplementary statement from my Right Rev. Brother, the assistant bishop of the diocese, specifying his official acts from the date of his consecration; which will be perceived to manifest the wisdom of there having been made such a provision for the episcopacy, as to detach it from the cares and labours of a parochial connexion. To these, the small remainder of my days will be principally devoted; although not without such a measure of episcopal concern and agency, as shall be permitted by any share of health and of strength to be continued to me by a gracious Providence. That measure of episcopal superintendence is essential to my being governed by those views of our holy religion on which I have always acted, and on which it is my expectation to continue to act, during the small remainder of my days, so far as I shall be permitted by a sufficiency of body and of mind; and I humbly implore the guidance of the grace of God, and the directing to his glory, and to the increase and stability of the church, of any feeble endeavours which I may yet put forth with a reference to those ends.

WILLIAM WHITE.

#### *Remarks on the above Address.*

We cannot insert the above, without expressing our sensibility to the renewed evidence which it affords of the interest taken by the venerable author in whatever concerns the beloved and revered bishop of our diocese. If ever man has been called to evince that noble sincerity and disinterestedness, which, supported by the testimony of a good conscience, goes on in the unwearied discharge of duty, appalled by no difficulties, daunted by no opposition, and casting behind him the time-serving calculations of personal ease and quiet, of dread of responsibility, and of love of popular liking, Bishop Hobart is that man. And the strong and decided testimony to the truth which he deemed it his duty to bear on the interesting occasion of Bishop Onderdonk's consecration, appears to have been the signal, to some of his active and violent opponents, for laying aside whatever of decency, of

moral honesty, and of Christian feeling, may before have been preserved in their attacks. Among these, we should be sorry to think that any have gone farther in outraging the moral and religious sensibilities of good and reflecting men, than the author, of whose malignant effusions, so justly termed by Bishop White, "*calumnies*," that venerable man could not refrain from declaring his "*abhorrence*." It is a strong term, and perhaps, may unpleasantly affect the nerves of the "moderate" correspondent of the *Charleston Gospel Messenger*, who lately honoured us with a notice; but it is the genuine expression of an honourable and truly Christian mind.

Some of our readers will remember the distressing series of contention, troubles, and difficulties, through which our diocese was safely carried by the good hand of God, immediately before, and for some time after, the accession of our present diocesan to the episcopate. This contention, and these troubles and difficulties, it was the wicked effort of the calumniator reprobated by Bishop White, to renew, by a republication of the charges then industriously circulated against Bishop Hobart; but long since proved and known to be unfounded and libellous. To those who remember, or have access to, the discussions then arising out of those charges, and the decisions then made upon them, we fear not the consequences of having them reiterated, as often as this may serve the purpose of, malignant feeling, or of dark design, except as those consequences respect the dignity of the church, the cause of Christ, the characters of the assailants, and the feelings of worthy men, who were then carried away by the boldness and effrontery with which charges were brought, but who have since candidly acknowledged their mistake, and been amongst the bishop's most decided friends. But a generation, then too young to enter into the subject, have since grown up. They now hear, for the first time, and with all the injustice of an *ex parte* statement, of charges seriously affecting the moral and religious character of one whom they have been taught to reverence and love. On this account, we are not certain that it will not be a duty to lay the whole again before the public. It is easy to say, in quiet and comfortable speculation, that this is unnecessary, and that the character of Bishop Hobart is a sufficient hinderance to any ill effects from the republication to which we refer. This may suit good easy men, who like not trouble and responsibility. But the public are more influenced by fact than by speculation. And great as is their present respect and regard for the distinguished prelate concerned, it is asking too

much of them not to be influenced by imposing and uncontradicted evidence, that he reached the mitre through ambition, intrigue, and injustice; and disgraced it by intolerance and persecution, in the first movements of his episcopal career.

It would have been a most gratifying evidence of the assuaging and sanctifying influence of the spirit of our holy religion, and would have gone far to prevent ill effects, if we could have had some credible assurance that this effort to renew disturbances in our church, by the republication of his own book, was without the privy and approbation of the gentleman who originally was so nearly connected with them.

There is still another most important view of the subject. The inflictor of this scandal upon our church, has gone to England, laden with his venomous productions. Our bishop is well known there; and is not unfrequently the subject of remark in their religious journals. His reviler—strange as it may appear, and disgusting as it renders the party prostitution of the terms—is known, and will there parade himself, as one of the more pious and evangelical of our clergy. In his mad zeal, he feels it his duty to destroy Bishop Hobart if he can. What will be the issue there we know not.

In fine. We wait with patience—but God forbid that it should be without the liveliest interest and concern—to see to what course circumstances will direct as the path of duty. That we are prepared to follow. Rest the blame where the blame is due, if the painful necessity should exist of again bringing this whole subject before the church. We esteem it no light matter to save our nerves at the expense of the character and influence of one who deserves to stand so high, and with so unclouded a reputation, in reference to past as well as present, in the esteem of all good men. Very good men may question the decisions of his head; but they should not be abused by suffering such serious imputations upon his heart to go unnoticed. Ingratitude, too, to God, not to be named in the same breath with the dictates of true piety, would it be, when, by his grace, the labours of our diocesan have, for years, been so abundant, and so productive; and he, by the same grace, has been so largely blessed with religious and moral qualifications for his work, the hallelujahs with which the faithful would acknowledge these mercies, should be suffered to be qualified by the mortifying reflection—the fruit of calumny and falsehood—that, after all, the instrument has been one so untrue to the spirit of his religion, so unfit for his high and holy vocation, and so undeserving of public confidence and esteem.

## Notice.

THE next Session of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, will commence on Monday, October 6th; on which day, at 12 o'clock, the students and candidates for admission, are requested to assemble in the Seminary chapel. The following are the qualifications for entering:—

"Persons producing satisfactory evidence of their being candidates for holy orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church, with full (that is, including *literary*) attainments, agreeably to the 8th canon of the General Convention of 1820,\* will, on application, be received into the Seminary.

"All others will be admitted who produce satisfactory evidence of religious and moral character, and a diploma from some college; or, if they have not been through college, stand a satisfactory examination by the Faculty, on the general principles of natural and moral philosophy, and rhetoric; and in the Latin and Greek languages, on the following works, or such others as shall be considered an equivalent substitute:—Sallust, Virgil's *Æneid*, Cicero's *Orations*, or *De Officiis*; and the four Gospels, Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, and the first three books of Homer.

"Every candidate must enter the third or lowest class, at the commencement of the fall session; or stand a satisfactory examination on the studies which have been pursued by the class into which he seeks admittance.

"The board at the Seminary is about two dollars per week."

It is particularly requested of the students and candidates to be present on the day of opening, as many inconveniences are found to result from individuals joining the classes after the commencement of the session.

The following standing regulation of the Faculty is published in the hope of its preventing disappointments:—

"Whereas the Faculty is deeply impressed with a sense of the inconveniences and disadvantages which would arise from

\* "This should be particularly noted in the certificate, as the mere fact of their being candidates for orders is not sufficient."

¶ We regret the necessity, arising out of the press of matter for the present number, of postponing until the next, a variety of articles of intelligence, and among them notices of the late meetings of several Conventions, and of the Directors of the General Missionary Society, and the Sunday School Union, and the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary; also of the Commencement of that Seminary, held in St. John's chapel, in this city, on Friday, June 27th; and also of an obituary notice of Miss Geslain. We have only room, at present, to mention, that on the last occasion six young gentlemen received the honours of the Seminary, who will probably soon be added to the number of our clergy. There were present at the Commencement the Right Rev. Bishops White, Hobart, Moore, Croes, Brownell, and Onderdonk; who were also favoured with the company of their Right Rev. Brother, the Lord Bishop of Nova-Scotia, now on a visit to this city.

allowing the privileges of students to those who are not such; therefore,

"Resolved, That it be a standing regulation of this board, that no person shall hereafter be allowed to attend the recitations or lectures, or be admitted to any other privileges of students, who is not a regularly admitted member of one of the classes."

The Editors of the several Protestant Episcopal periodical works in the United States are requested to insert the above.

By order of the Faculty,

B. T. ONDERDONK, Secretary.

New-York, June 27, 1828.

## Acknowledgment.

THE Treasurer of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society, acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz.

1828.	
9th May. From the "Auxiliary Female Missionary Society of St. Paul's Church, Troy,	\$ 252 75
10th May. Donation from Mr. C. J. Aldis, of New-York,	20 00
12th May. Collection at St. Mark's church, after a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Upfold,*	56 54
19th May. The Auxiliary Female Missionary Society of Grace church, New-York,	187 09
11th June. Donation from Benjamin Haight, Esq.	10 00
17th June. "A Friend," by J. R. Wheaton, Esq.	9 00
21st June. Received of the Auxiliary Female Missionary Society of St. John's chapel, New-York,	160 00
	<hr/> \$ 695 38

BENJ. M. BROWN, Treasurer.

June 30, 1828.

## Calendar for August, 1828.

3. Ninth Sunday after Trinity.
10. Tenth Sunday after Trinity.
17. Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.
24. } Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.  
St. Bartholomew.
31. Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

\* Total amount received from preaching of this sermon, 1,346 dollars and 38 cents.